

THE
Question of Questions,

WHICH
RIGHTLY RESOLV'D
RESOLVES

All our Questions in Religion.

This Question is,

*Who ought to be our Judge
in all these Differences?*

This Book answers this Question:

And shews a most easie, and safe way, how
among so many Religions the most unlearn'd
and learn'd may find the True.

By *James Mumford* Priest, of the Society
of J E S U S.

*Call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter,
and he will tell thee what thou oughtest to
do, Acts 10. Vers. 5, 6.*

The Second Edition Corrected.

Permissu Superiorum.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the Kings
Most Excellent Majesty for His Household
and Chappel, for him and *Matt. Turner* at
the *Lamb* in *Holburn*. 1684.

THE
Question of Question

WHICH
RIGHTLY RESOLVED

THE QUESTION IS

WHO OUGHT TO BE OUR

GOVERNOR

AND THIS IS THE QUESTION

WHICH IS THE

GOVERNOR

OF THE

GOVERNMENT

OF THE

GOVERNMENT

THE LAND IN HELMERS. 1687.

The Table.

A Table of the several Questions and
Sections into which the four foregoing
Points are divided.

The four chief Points handled in this Book.

W

The Preface.

The first Point.

That there must be some infallible Judge,
or Rule to decide all necessary Controver-
sies, to whom all are bound under pain of
Damnation to submit their Understandings.

Quest. 1.

The second Point.

That the Scripture is not this infallible
Judge or Rule appointed us by God to end all
our Controversies.

Quest. 2.

The third Point.

That the Church is the Judge appointed
by God to end all our Controversies in Faith.

Quest. 3.

The fourth Point.

That the Church which is the infallible
Judge in all Controversies, is the Roman
Church, and therefore all are bound to sub-
mit to her.

Quest. 4.

A

A

A Table

A Table of the several Questions and Sections into which the four foresaid Points are divided.

The Question of Questions.

W Ho ought to be Judge in all Controversies?

The Preface.

The importance of this Question, and how easily even ignorant People may come to be fully resolv'd in it, all being reduc'd to four only Points.

Quest. I.

Whether there must be some infallible Judge or Rule to decide all necessary Controversies, to whom all are bound under pain of damnation to submit their Understanding? And how orderly we proceed in the finding out this Judge.

Pag. 1

Quest. II.

Whether the Scripture be this infallible Judge or Rule appointed us by God to decide all necessary Controversies?

Pag. 12

Sect. 1.

Containing five proofs that Scripture is not this Judge or Rule.

Pag. 12

Sect. 2.

The Scripture contains not plainly all things necessary to be believ'd or done to Salvation. This is shew'd by 14 Examples.

Pag. 36

Sect. 3.

The Table.

Sect. 3.

By Scripture we know not which Books are Canonical Scripture, which not. Neither is Scripture known to be Gods Word by its own light. Wherefore Protestants do not believe Scripture with Divine Faith. Pag. 60

Sect. 4.

That the Scriptures cannot decide this Controversie, which Books are the true uncorrupted Copies of the true Books of Scripture. And therefore Protestants believe not Scripture with Divine Faith. A word of the famous Bible now publishing at London.

Pag. 90

Sect. 5.

That Scripture cannot decide this Controversie, Which Translations of the Word of God are true? And therefore ordinary Protestants cannot believe Scripture with Divine Faith.

Pag. 122

Sect. 6.

That the Scripture cannot decide the Controversie about the truth of St. Matthew's Gospel. And that our Adversaries do not believe this Gospel with Divine Faith. Pag. 144

Sect. 7.

That the Scripture cannot decide the manifest Controversies about the true sense thereof; Therefore in the belief of the true sense thereof our Adversaries have no Divine Faith, nor sure ground out of their Religion. Pag. 152

The Table.

Sect. 8.

Diverse other necessary Points not contain'd in, or decided by Scripture. Pag. 188

Sect. 9.

A four and twentieth necessary Point not contain'd in Scripture. Pag. 204

Sect. 10.

By the Text which our Adversaries bring to prove, that Scripture contains and decides all necessary Controversies, we prove the contrary. Pag. 215

Sect. 11.

Altho' Scripture only should be our Judge: Yet this Judge would decide many Points clearly against you. Pag. 250

Sect. 12.

That Holy Fathers never allow'd Scripture for the only Rule of Faith. Pag. 255

Quest. III.

Whether the Church be the Judge appointed by God to end all our Controversies. With a word to the Socinians, concerning Reason being our Judge. Pag. 263

Sect. 13.

It is declar'd what we understand when we seek whether the Church be our Judge or no. Pag. 267

Sect. 14.

It is prov'd out of the Old Testament, that the Church is our infallible Judge in all Controversies of Faith. Pag. 271

Sect. 15.

The Table:

Sect. 15.

It is proved out of the New Testament that the Church is our infallible Judge in all Controversies of Faith.

Pag. 289.

Sect. 16.

The same is proved by several Reasons. P. 234.

QUESTION IV.

Which is that Church which is the infallible Judge in all Controversies? How she exerciseth her infallible Judgment? And what submission is due unto her?

Pag. 371.

Sect. 17.

Whether the Roman Church be that Church which is our infallible Judge?

Pag. 373.

Sect. 18.

In what Court this infallible Judge decides our Controversies in Faith?

Pag. 377.

Sect. 19.

This Court in deciding Controversies Rules her self by the Word of God written and unwritten. And why she Rules her self by Tradition?

Pag. 394.

Sect. 20.

That the Fathers teach these Traditions, and the Definitions of Councils or Church to be infallible.

Pag. 422.

Sect. 21.

That the Fathers teach in general the Church to be infallible.

Pag. 435.

Sect. 22.

That all which the Fathers say of the Infallibility of the Church in her Traditions or

The Table.

Councils, or in general Terms, is meant by them particularly of the Roman Church as we understand the Roman Church. Pag. 463

Sect. 23.

Some things very necessary for the easier Answering our Adversaries Objection. Pag. 477.

Sect. 24.

Twenty Objections of an University Man against the Infallibility of the Church, and also some others are solved Pag. 493

Sect. 25.

The Roman Church having been proved to be our infallible Judge, all under pain of Damnation are bound to submit to her Judgment. Pag. 522

A

A 3

A Table of some particular Matters
 incidently treated in this Book.

OF Reading the Scripture, and using Di-
 vine Service in the vulgar Tongue;
 Quest. 2. Sect. 1. Num. 10, 11. p. 31

Of doing good works for hope of Reward,
 Quest. 2. Sect. 4. N. 6. p. 102

Of the great difference in fundamentals be-
 tween the Roman Catholics and Protestants,
 Q. 2. S. 2. N. 13. p. 56. and Q. 2. S. 7.
 N. 7, 8, 9, 10, &c. p. 170

Of the necessity of Baptism for Children,
 Q. 2. S. 8. N. 3. &c. p. 144

Of the Fast of Lent, Q. 2. S. 8. N. 8. p. 202

How Protestants are cheated by their Mini-
 sters who say to them, Come with us and you
 shall see evidence of Scripture for all you believe
 and do. And how Roman Catholics see bet-
 ter reason for what they believe and do, than
 Protestants, Q. 2. S. 2. N. 13. pag. 56. Q. 2.
 S. 4. N. 7, 8. p. 104. Q. 2. S. 5. N. 2, 3, 4, 5.
 p. 128. Q. 2. S. 7. N. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. p. 164.
 Q. 3. S. 16. N. 7. p. 359

That the Power of Judging Ecclesiastical
 affairs belongs not to the Lay, Q. 4. S. 18.
 N. 3. p. 381.

It is a sin to Marry after Vowed Chastity,
 Q. 4. S. 20. N. 4. p. 427

A Table.

Faith is more assuredly grounded upon Tradition than upon manifest Miracles, Q. 3. S. 16. N. 5. P. 353

No Circle in the Resolution of Faith made by the Roman Catholics, Q. 3. S. 16. N. 6. P. 356. The Protestants Circle, Q. 2. S. 2. N. 13. P. 88

How the Belief, even of ignorant Roman Catholics comes to be infallible, Q. 3. S. 16. N. 7. P. 379

What it is which makes our Faith infallible, tho' we have no infallible knowledge of this Infallibility, Q. 4. S. 23. N. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. &c. P. 482

Prayer for the Dead better grounded than Baptism for Children, Q. 4. S. 19. N. 4. P. 400

Also better grounded than the Faith by which Protestants believe the Apocalypsi to be Scripture. They were held for Heretics who denyed Prayer for the dead. Ibidem. The Church shined with the Custom of Praying for the Dead in St. Austins days. Ibidem.

THE

T H E
Question of Questions,

Who ought to be our Judge in all
Controversies?

The P R E F A C E.

The importance of this Question, and how easily, even ignorant Men may come to be fully resolv'd in it, all being reduc'd to four only Points.

I. **S**aint Anselm has a very fit Similitude to express, how much a contentious Spirit in disputing do's blind the Understanding from seeing that Truth, which a peaceable search, free from all prejudice, do's easily discover. He tells us, that a little before Sun-rising, two Men in the open Fields fell into a hot debate concerning that part of the Heavens, in which the Sun was that Day to rise; they pass'd so far in their contention, that falling first together

The importance of this Question, and how

together by the Ears, they at last pull'd out one anothers Eyes; whence it happen'd, that when after the Sun had risen, neither of them could both see a thing so clear as was that part of the Heaven, in which the Sun did shine so conspicuously to all Men who had Eyes. To our purpose, many Thousands there be, who knowing Zeal in Religion to be laudable, and having a most prejudicate Opinion of the truth of that Religion, in which they were from the first use of Reason bred up, and which brings many Temporal Benefits unto them; they stand so hotly to the maintaining thereof, that their passionate affection quite puts out that clear Eye-sight of Reason: Whence it comes to pass, that when the Truth is no less clearly set before the Eyes of their Understanding, than the brightest Sun-shine is set before our Corporeal Eyes, they are not in case to behold it, though Men of mean capacity would most evidently see it, when they have laid aside all passion and prejudice, and with a calm and humble mind, begged of Almighty God, Grace to embrace that sincerely, which upon diligent search, they should understand to be Truth. He who thus seeks, shall not fail to find.

II. I know the multitude of Controversies which have been rais'd this last
Age,

ignorant Men may easily be resolv'd in it.

Age, and the manifold difficulties with which they are now grown to be intangled, do make the search of Truth seem an impossibility to the ignorant, and overwearisom to the most strong and struggling Wits: Therefore no Books seem now more necessary than such Treatises which handle the main Question of Questions, upon which all other particular Questions so wholly depend, that the true solution of it do's necessarily draw with it the solution of all other Controversies which are, or can be. This Question of Questions is, Whether God, out of his most sincere desire to bring all Souls to that happy Eternity for which only he created them, has not left us some Judge upon Earth to end all our otherwise endless Controversies? And who this Judge is? For the incomparably greater part of those Souls, for which *Christ* has shed his most precious Blood, being unlearn'd, his Providence had been defective, if the means of ending Controversies in Points necessary to Salvation, had been so hard to be applied, that it had been out of the vulgar reach. It beseeemed therefore the Divine Providence to leave us such means as should be both easie for all Men to use (that so all Men might, by the use of them, come to the end which God so earnestly desires) and

The importance of this Question, and how

and should also be most sufficient for our safe direction. For, to provide us of easie means, which had been insufficient to direct us securely, had not been to His, or our purpose.

III. We must say then, that God has provided us both of means sufficient to bring us securely to the knowledge of that Truth, which is necessary for the Salvation of our Souls; and we must say also, that this means is sufficiently easie to be duly us'd, and apply'd by the far greater part of the World, consisting of unlearned People. For if it were not sufficiently easie to them to apply it duly, so as by it to attain to that true Belief, *Without which it is impossible to please God* (Heb. 11. 6.) It would also be unprofitable unto that end for which God did give it them. This is most agreeable to Reason, and also to those most comfortable words of Scripture (Isa. 35.) *Say to the faint-hearted take courage and fear not. Behold God himself will come and will save you. Then the Eyes of the Blind shall be opened, and the Ears of the Deaf. And there shall be a Path and a Way, and it shall be call'd the Holy Way. And this shall be unto you a direct Way, so that Fools cannot err by it.* These words must be made good, and therefore such a Way must be given unto us. And it must not only be a Way direct to
bms it

ignorant Men may easily be resolv'd in it.

it self, but also it must be *unto us a direct Way*, and that so direct, *that even Fools cannot* (except wilfully) *err by it.* This Way was promis'd to be given us, as it is there said, *when God himself should come and save us*, and provide better for our Salvation than he had done for those of either the Law of Nature, or Jewish Law. Our labor must be to find out this way. And this must not be hard, even to the Ignorant. For it had been to small purpose to provide somewhere, in this vast World, a Way, so direct for the guidance of the ignorant, without the means to be put in this Way, were also sufficiently easie, even unto them, as ignorant as they are. See my second Section, also the 3, 4, 5, 6.

IV. I intend then (by the Grace of God) in this Treatise to shew, that this Way may be easily found out, by only satisfying our selves in the true Resolution of this Question of Questions, leading us to know assuredly, *Who is to be our Judge in all our Controversies appointed to be so by God himself.* For when we have once found him, all Controversies cease of what Questions soever; for without all Controversie we must follow this Judge appointed by God to no other end, than to make an end of all our Controversies by his clear Sentence;
Whence

The Importance of this Question, and how

Whence Dr. Fern in his 27 Section: *Indeed such a Judge or Umpire of Christendom would (if to be had) be a ready means to compose all differences, and restore truth and peace.* We will then endeavor to shew that such a Judge is to be had: And our prime care shall be to proceed so clearly, that a Man of ordinary capacity, may carry away the substance of our whole Discourse, which for this effect, we draw to only Four Points. *First*, I shall shew that we must have some infallible Judge, or Rule, deciding all our necessary Controversies, to which Rule we will shew all Men bound under pain of Damnation to submit, even with interior submission of Judgment. *Secondly*, I will shew at large that the Scripture is not this Judge or Rule, which Point will require a very full examination, because our Adversaries ground themselves mainly in the contrary Opinion, and all our new Sects have no other ground at all. I will shew *Thirdly*, That this infallible Judge can be no other (as things stand) than the true Catholic Church; And this must be also fully handled, because it is the ground of our Religion, and the true Resolution of the Question of Questions depends wholly on it. *Lastly*, I will shew, that all the Arguments, which convince the true Catholic Church to be this Judge

ignorant Men may easily be resolved in it.

Judge, do convince the *Roman*, and no Church but the *Roman*, to be this infallible Judge, to whom all consequently must be bound under pain of Damnation to submit their Judgments, and accordingly live united to her Communion. This blessed Union will end our Controversies.

V. Indeed this Question of Questions truly resolved quite undermines the Foundation of all Sects opposite to the *Roman* Church, shewing us a most easie, and yet a most safe way, how in these times the most learned and unlearned may find the true Religion, to-wit, by following the Judgment of that Judge, whom God has appointed them in all doubts of Religion to follow. And therefore, in this infinite Confusion of new-fangled Sects, this Question (tho' never so often handled heretofore,) seems now more necessary than ever, even altho' I should do nothing else but Publish new Copies of old Arguments; such Copies being now so very necessary to be thrust into every Mans hands. My best Endeavors shall aim at making these Arguments truly Public; that is, to set them down so plainly, and in so vulgar and clear Language, devoid of School Terms, that ordinary People may fully conceive and perfectly understand the force of them. If my endeavors

The importance of this Question, &c.

endeavors in this can be successful, I hope
this Work, after so many other Men's
Writings, will not be unreasonable at
least for the Vulgar. But they must
have Patience with a long Answer to a
most important and ample Question.

V. Indeed this Question of Questions
truly resolved once underlines the con-
clusion of all sorts opposite to the Roman
Church, showing us a most calm, and yet
a most safe way, how in these times the
most learned and unlearned may find the
true Religion, to-wit, by following the
Judgment of that Judge, whom God
has appointed them in all doubts or Re-
ligion to follow. And therefore, in this
infinite number of new printed &c.
this Question (who never is written hand-
led before) seems now more neces-
sary than ever, even when I should do
nothing else but Publish new Copies of
old Arguments; such Copies being now
so very necessary to be reprinted every
where. And I have therefore still
aimed at making these Arguments more
plain, and in-to-vulgar and clear Language,
devoid of School Terms, that ordinary
People may fully conceive and possibly
find the true Religion, in my own

T H E
FIRST QUESTION.

Whether there must be some Infallible Judge or Rule to deduce all necessary Controversies, to whom all are bound, under pain of Damnation, to submit their Understandings? and, How orderly we proceed to the finding out of this Judge.

I. **T**HIS Question is put in the first place, rather for Order sake, than for any debatable difficulty which it contains.

For all Christians, of what Religion soever they be, do agree in this, that there must be some certain and assured Means to end all Controversies or Doubts, which either be, or can be in Religion. The Reason is apparent, because otherwise every Man might be left free to believe what he judged best, and so we should soon have as many Religions as there be private and different Judgments. Truth is but One: wherefore tho' all these different Opinions may be false, yet it is manifest that (tho' they be

B

thou-

thousands) but only one of them can be true. For whosoever differs from this one Opinion which is true, differs from the Truth. St. Paul tells us (*Heb. 11. 6.*) *Without Faith it is impossible to please God.* That is, it is impossible to please him *without true Faith*; for he is not pleased *with false Faith*. Without we please God, it is impossible to be saved; and you see it is impossible to please him without true Faith. And again you see that true Faith cannot be found in quite contrary Persuasions, of which one only can be true; there must therefore be some Means to know this one true Faith from so infinite a multitude of false Opinions. What Means is this?

2. It must be a Means Infallible, as all Christians agree, but *Socinians*. For if it be Fallible, all Religion may be a Fancy. Christian Faith is an Infallible Assent, to which no Fallible Means can bring us. This Means therefore must be Infallible. Hitherto we all agree. See *Whitaker Cont.*

1. *2. 1. Cap. 8.*

3. All also cannot but agree in this, that our inward Understanding must be bound, under pain of Damnation, to submit it self unto that Infallible Judge, or Rule appointed by God to decide all necessary Controversies. For if you in your Private Judgment, without any fault

fault at all, may follow what you really think fittest to be followed, why may not I, as well as you, and another, as well as you or I, follow what really seems fittest to be followed? Wherefore, it were to no purpose at all (in order to the preservation of Unity in Faith) to have an Infallible Judge, unless every Man in particular were bound, by a most strict Precept, to submit to that Judge. Again, he who should not submit to an Authority acknowledg'd to be appointed by God to such an End, should manifestly resist to be govern'd by that Means by which the Divine Providence had decreed to govern him; which is a damnable Rebellion against God; and an Act of High Treason it is against the Divine Majesty, to refuse to stand to the Judgment of that Judge, or Determination of that Rule, which God has placed for no other End, but for all to stand and submit unto it, that by this Submission they may be guided infallibly to that One true Faith, without which it is impossible to please God, or be saved. Now because all Faith essentially consists in the inward Understanding (which is the very Seat of true or false Faith) God, who looks upon our interior Soul, expects to see in that a ready embracing of that Faith, without

which no Salvation is to be had; and therefore he should not seriously desire our Salvation, unless he desired that we interiorly yielded full assent to this one and only saving Faith: which Faith consisting essentially (as I said) in the interior Judgment, God would have this Judgment readily to submit to that Infallible Judges Determination, appointed by him, as the only Means to bring us assuredly to this one true Faith. Things which are necessary to please God, must of necessity be things of Precept and strict Command, even under pain of Damnation, because our very greatest Obligation, of all Obligations, is to obey his Will and Pleasure. And his Sacred Pleasure is, to exact that most at our Hands, which is most for our good, and which makes most for our Salvation. True Faith therefore being a necessary Means to bring us to our eternal Good, he, with all Reason, exacts of us all, to submit our interior Understanding (the very Seat of true or false Faith) to the full assent of that which shall be prescribed us to believe, by that Means which his Holy Providence shall assign us, for our guidance in Faith, that so all may be united in Faith interiorly; for indeed otherwise they are not of one Faith at all. And hence again appears that
this

to whom all must submit.

5

this Means must be Infallible; for it is not possible that God should put a Command upon all to follow that which might lead to any Error, great or little.

4. Out of this general Doctrine, receiv'd universally without any considerable contradiction, there follows manifestly this Consequence, That two Men, of two different Religions, cannot be sav'd, if both of them know what Doctrine is taught them by that Infallible Judge or Rule, appointed them by God to be follow'd, as their Guide, in Matters of Faith. For both these Men, knowing on the one side that God has put an Obligation upon them, to submit to the believing of that which is propos'd by his Infallible Judge or Rule; and yet, on the other side, one of them flatly refusing to believe what is thus propos'd unto him; this one, who proceeds thus, must needs be guilty of the damnable Sin of refractory Disobedience against the express Command of God, obliging strictly all to submit to the Judge appointed by him to guide all to the necessary true Faith, and known to be so appointed. Hence it is Scripture; *He who do's not believe, shall be damned, Mark 16. v. 16.* And of those who follow Sects, *St. Paul saith, Gal. 5. 20, 21. They who do these things, shall not obtain the Kingdom of Heaven.*

B 3-

5. These

There must be a Judge

5. These Principles I lay down so distinctly in the Beginning, and will again inculcate at the Ending, that all may see of how high concernment it is to make use of this Means, wholly necessary to that only true Faith, without which it is impossible to please God, and to be sav'd. They therefore are in a damnable case, who being strictly oblig'd to use that Means which is wholly necessary to come to the knowledge of this only true Faith, do not inform themselves carefully to find out this Means appointed by God to guide and direct all to this only true Faith; either fondly believing, that Men of contrary Religions may be sav'd (which we have just now prov'd to be false, except in case of Invincible Ignorance) or else, by damnable negligence, omitting to use that serious Care in seeking out and solicitously searching the knowledge of this Means, which they are oblig'd to do, in a Matter concerning a no less Business than an Eternity of everlasting Bliss, or never-ending Misery. Now lest any one should secretly despair of finding out this Means, and so grow slack in the search of it, (which is the lamentable Case of many thousands) I (in my Preface at the beginning) took care to shew, that even ignorant People might, by a very tolerable

to whom all must submit. 7

rable Care, come to the knowledge of this Means, or else God had not sufficiently, according to his most sweet Providence, provided for the far greater part of those Souls for whose Salvation he died, intending to save them all, by first bringing them to the Profession of this only true Faith; and consequently, intending to leave them some certain Means to come to the knowledge of it, by such Diligence as is very tolerable to Human Frailty, and very possible to us, as ignorant as we are.

6. What then is this Means? It is (as I said in the beginning of this Question) to follow some Infallible Judge or Rule, directing us plainly and clearly to the knowledge of what God would have us believe; to whom we are all bound, under pain of Damnation, to submit our Understandings. But who is this Judge or Rule? This is the Question of Questions. Here we, and all Protestants, and all other Sectaries notably disagree. They all say, that we are oblig'd to follow, and admit no other infallible Rule than the Scripture, which Scripture they all affirm to be a Rule sufficient, by it self alone, to tell us so plainly and so clearly all that is necessary to Salvation in Matters of Faith, that we need no other Means to direct us in this Point. We,

who are Roman Catholics, hold the Scripture to be indeed a Rule Infallible, and to which all are bound, under pain of Damnation, to submit their Understandings; but we have very many, and very convincing Reasons, which move us to believe, that God did not intend the Holy Scripture to be, by it self alone, our only Guide in Matters of Faith necessary to Salvation, as I shew by Five Proofs in the first Section. Moreover, we say, that we stand in need of some other Infallible Guide, to know many things necessary to Salvation, which are not clearly set down in Scripture; and I shall shew no fewer than Twenty four, all not to be known by Scripture, which do's not tell us which Books be the true Word of God, which be not; which be true uncorrupted Copies of these Books, which Copies be false and corrupted, and in what places they be corrupted. Here comes in an unanswerable Difficulty about St. *Matthew's* Gospel. Again, we stand in need of another Infallible Guide, to tell us which is the true, certain, and undoubted Sense of these true Copies, and which is not: For, from hence arise almost all our greatest Controversies. Again, because our Adversaries, without such an Infallible Guide, different from Scriptures, can neither infallibly

fallibly know which Books be the true Word of God, which be not; nor which be the true Original Copies of these true Books, which not; nor which the true Translations of the true Originals; nor which is the undoubted Sense of these true Originals or Copies, and which is not. Hence we conceive it impossible for them truly to believe Scripture with that Divine Faith, which is grounded always upon Divine Revelation, and is wholly necessary to Salvation. Whence we hold our selves only to be the true Believers of Scripture; for we believe it with that Faith which rests upon Divine Revelation. Moreover, by our Adversaries Arguments alledged out of Scripture, to prove it to be the only Rule of Faith, sufficient by it self to decide all necessary Controversies, we prove, that it is not such a Rule. Yea, tho' Scripture were granted to be this Rule, we from hence can prove, that it clearly decides many necessary Controversies for us against our Adversaries. But we hold, that for our Rule, clearly deciding all necessary Controversies, we must have a Living Judge, which the Scripture is not; and therefore the Holy Fathers, in their Disputations against Heretics, often refus'd to stand to Scripture only. This Infallible Living Judge, we say, is the

B 5

Church,

Church, regulating her self in her Determinations according to the Infallible Rule of God's Word, out of which Word she judgeth her self to be oblig'd also to rule her self according to those Traditions which the Apostles did deliver by word of Mouth only, and not by Writing. For the Scripture not containing all Matters necessary to Salvation, but the Apostles of Christ delivering some of these Matters only by word of Mouth, she rules also her self in her Definitions according to these Traditions, knowing that those things which the Apostles taught by word of Mouth, are no less worthy all Credit, than what they taught by Pen and Paper. And by the same Traditions she is as sufficiently assur'd of what was deliver'd only by word of Mouth, as of what was deliver'd by Pen and Paper. Now lest that in taking true Scripture for false, true Traditions for false, or in delivering the true Sense of the one or the other, this Church should be subject to Error, we say, she is in these Matters always assisted, in her Public Determinations, by the Infallible Assistance of the Holy Ghost, promis'd to her for this End, to lead her into all Truth. That Chief Court, in which she delivers to the People her Infallible Definitions, we all hold
to

to be Lawful General Councils, in which the Supreme Pastor of the Church presides. Neither do's this Church want Means to make all her Decrees evidently known to the People, to be her true Decrees. And all this, which has hitherto been said of the Church in general, we shew to be verified only of the *Roman Church*; of whom also all these prime things which the Scriptures say of the true Church, are verified, and united in her alone. The *Roman Church* therefore being this our Infallible Judge, appointed by God to end and determine all our Controversies, all under pain of Damnation are to submit their inward Judgments and Understandings to her Decrees; Neither are they in state of Salvation, who refuse to do it.

7. Here you have a brief Sum of all our Doctrin in general, and just almost in that very Order that I have deliver'd here so many important Points, without bringing here any full Proof of them. I shall now proceed to the full Proof of all, and every one of these Points here set down so briefly, to the end that thou may'st see how clearly we proceed, resolving first this Question, *Who is to be our Judge?* by shewing in divers Sections, that the Scripture is not Judge: And then shewing, that this Infallible

12 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

fallible Judge can be no other than the Church: And thirdly, that this Church can be no other than the *Roman*. And consequently, all that has hitherto been said, or hereafter shall be said, to agree to the Infallible Judge (whom we are now seeking out) is verified of the *Roman* Church, and of no other.

Q U E S T. II.

*Whether the Scripture be this Infallible Judge
or Rule appointed us by God to decide all
necessary Controversies.*

Sect. I.

*Containing Five Proofs, That Scripture is not
this Judge or Rule.*

I. **A**Ll Protestants, and all that numberless number of our new Sectaries, do affirm, That the Scripture, and only the Scripture by it self alone, is that infallible Rule, by which all necessary controversies that are, or can be, are to be decided. As for the means to regulate our selves in the knowledge of true, and false Scripture, and for the finding the certain and undoubted true sense of the same, they make no
other

other use of the Authority of any Church or any General Council, but to consider of what they say, and ponder how agreeable, or disagreeable their opinions be to Scripture; And then, if, by their private judgment of discretion, they in their own understandings be convinced that, what they say, is agreeable to Scripture, they, for this reason, give belief unto it. If they by their private judgment of discretion be convinced that what they say, is not agreeable to Scripture, they freely reject it, and disbelieve it. And this has ever been the proceeding of all ancient Heretics and is ever like to be the proceeding of all Heretics to come. For by this means they all come to that, which they all desire, that is, to have that pass for Truth which each of them, in their private judgments of discretion, do think to be true according to their manner of understanding the Scripture. And they all trust more to their private understanding of the Scripture, than they do trust to the interpretation of it made by the greatest Doctors that ever the Church of God had for these thousand and six hundred years, how holy or how learned so ever they were: Yea more than they will trust all the chief Pastors and Prelats of the Church assembled in a General Council, after they have

14 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

have with all mature deliberation consider'd all the Texts of Scriptures concerning such a point and conferr'd them with the originals, and with other places, and after they have examin'd each Bishop of each nation of what they find to have been deliver'd to them by their ancestors touching this point, by much Prayer, and public Fasts of all the Church diffused, implored the assistance of Almighty God to direct them to the knowledge of the truth in such a point. For after all this done, and after all these prime learned, and Holy Prelats of the Church, have, by full consent, defin'd such a point to be held as true, and that under pain of excommunication. Behold! When this Decree comes forth, there will start up some devout Cobler, or Weaver: He will take this Decree into the one hand, and in the other, he will take his English Bible, translated by some body, (tho' neither I, nor he have any assurance of his honesty or skill, or of the uncorruptedness of the Copy by which this English Bible was translated) yet into his hands he will take it. And then sincerely he will make a review of this Decree, or of the whole Book of Decrees, made by this, or by any general Council. And then if after his serious perusal of the matter, his rude understanding, accord-

ing

ing to his private judgment of discretion, do's in good earnest think this Decree (or all these Decrees) to be contrary to the word of God (rightly interpreted by him) this man, according to the Principles of our adversaries, may securely disbelieve this Doctrin, tho' propos'd by so great an Authority as I have said, yea tho' this Authority, as they themselves say, be the very greatest Authority upon Earth. To relate this prodigious opinion is enough to refute it; and to shew how far more rationally we *Roman* Catholics rather trust to the interpretations of General Councils, which we on the one side find seconded every where by the authority of the gravest Doctors of the Church of God, according to their judgment of discretion, and the Tradition and judgment, and perpetual practise of their Ancestors. And then, on the other side we see our own selves, that all this is to the very full as much, yea and far more agreeable to the word of God according to our own private judgment of discretion. Wherefore in this respect we are to the very full as well grounded as they, and we see as well what we do: But we infinitely exceed them in the advantage that we have, by following not only our own, but also a far better sighted judgment than our own, even
in

16 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

in the use of natural reason, besides which reason. those General Councils have a more special assistance of the Holy Ghost. And thus we persevere in all Ages in all unity, whil'st they in this one Age have so run division upon the ground of Scripture, that the meer relation of their several Sects in this one Age, with the several opinions of every Sect of this Age, fills whole Books, which be to be seen in every Stationers Shop. And it is a wonder if any new Year pass without one or more Religions springing up, as long as this one Principle passeth for current, and men may have free liberty to follow the consequences which manifestly follow from it, as of late they have it. If this daily hatching of Religions happen'd not sooner, it was because this liberty was not granted sooner. For altho' their Bishops held the Doctrin of giving all liberty to follow in Conscience what they in their private judgments of discretion held to be conformable to Gods Word; yet they very inconsequently, forced their Consciences to an exterior conformity, as long as their power lasted, for fear that should not last long, if men were permitted to practise what they were permitted and taught to believe.

2. But to go on more orderly, we say the Bible by it self alone is not this Judge,

or

or Rule appointed by God to decide all necessary Controversies; without you take the Bible as it, by many and very clear Texts, sends us for more full Instruction to the Church. In this sense, it is most true that the Bible is a very sufficient Rule, as shall hereafter be more fully declared. But we deny that, which our Adversaries affirm, That the Bible, taken by it self, do's suffice to decide, and end all our Controversies. This I prove first, by an argument so manifest, that, in these days, he must put out his eyes who will not see the truth of it. For who sees not now the Bible daily consulted, place conferr'd with place, the best Originals search'd for, and look'd for, and publish'd more than ever; and yet after this, who sees not that Controversies about the very chief Points of Religion, are so far from being lessened, that never was Age seen, or heard of, in which they multiplyed more? No sooner had *Martin Luther* broached this Principle, That every man might take the Bible into his hand, and follow that Interpretation, which after due diligence used, he thought to be best; but presently, there sprung up an incredible number of different Sects. For An. 1526. *Carlostadius*, *Zuinglius* and *OEcoulampadius* began to Preach that Opinion of the Sacramentaries, which

which denies *Christ* to be really present in the Sacrament (an Opinion which *Luther* did Curse untill his very death.) The next year after *Pacromontanus* and *Rothomannus*, retaining other Opinions of *Luther* brought in *Anabaptism*. And these *Anabaptists* are now grown, to be divided into twenty different Sects, all describ'd particularly by *Spanhemius*. In fine, *Luther* himself and his Disciples did so tumble about their new Religion, turning it with so many chops, and changes, that *OEcolumpadus* objected unto them, *If we reflect upon your dissensions, surely there are almost found among you seventy seven changes.* *Aqua responsio ad Lutherum. Præfat.* Their chief permanent Sects were, the *Antinomians*, *Oslandrians*, *Majorists*, *Synergists*, *Stancarians*, *Amsdorfians*, *Flavians*, *Substantiations*, *Accidentarians*, *Adiaphorists*, *Musculans*, *Pseffringians*, *Ubiquists*. So much for Lutherans.

3. Now in the year 1538. *John Calvin* a Disciple of *Zwinglius*, despising his Master did set up of himself, adding many Opinions to that of the Sacramentarians. This mans Religion and his Disciples began so quickly to be divided, and subdivided into so many Sects, that *Luther* did live to write thus of them: *I scarce ever read of a more deform'd Heresie, which presently in the beginning was divided*
into

into so many Heads, such a number of Sects (mark what follows) not one like another, and such variety and disagreeing of Opinions. Tom. 7. f. 380. And in another place he adds, Six or seven Sects of them to have risen in only two years space. Tom. 6. f. 335. Thus much could Luther say of their very beginnings. We, at this day, see that his English Disciples can ring the Changes as well as any of their Fore-fathers, so that now every Family is like a House in which the Master speaks high Dutch, the Mistress French, the Children, one Spanish, one Irish, one Scottish, and some Servants Welch, some Japonian, some Polonian, &c. And all this Babilonian confusion proceeds from this one principle, of thrusting the Bible (in the vulgar Language) into every hand, with teaching them this principle, Behold here is the only Rule God has given you to rule your selves by; and by which every one is to judge for himself, which is true Doctrin, which is false, after he has us'd such industries, as shall be declar'd, *Sett.* 2. n. 13. Tho' even after the use of all those industries we see with our eyes no end present, nor ever like to be made of our Controversies still encreasing, and encreasing like Snow falling from a Mountain.

4. A Second Reason much illustrating and declaring the former (because it discovers the true original cause why we should see no Controversies ever ended by standing only to the Sentence given by God in the Bible) is this, that whilst we take thus the Scriptures, for our only Rule, and God, as he speaks by the Scriptures alone, for our only Judge, we needs must fall into a vast confusion. For every one of us having our private Judgments as different almost from one another, as our faces are, and these Judgments being so very weak in hard, and high matters, how can it be but that presently we should come to frame different Judgments of the true Sense and Interpretation of that Sentence, which we find given by God in Scripture, as shall be very fully declar'd *Sett.* 7. Well then in this variety of Judgments you say we may refuse to stand to the interior imbracing of that Interpretation, which is made by the gravest General Council that can be gather'd upon Earth, unless perusing the definition of this Council, we, in our private Judgment of discretion, judge it conformable to the Word. But if (after use of such industries as you require) we, according to our private Judgment (so very various and so very weak in Points so hard) do really think the definition

finition not to be conformable to Scripture, then (you say) we may interiorly dissent from it: And yet it is true, That all Faith consists in the Interior assent. Whence it follows, That the last Rule which is followed, when all comes to all, is the Scripture, not taken as it sounds (for that we all reject) but taken in that sense which our private Judgment (for this is your Doctrin) draws from it. This is that, say we, which opens a wide gap to all Sectaries, and D. Fern in his 13 Sect. in vain labors to shew the contrary by telling them they must bring *evident Scripture and Demonstration against public Authority of the Church: And that upon dissent and gainsaying they must undergo the Churches Censures*, which Censures, according to our Adversaries Doctrin, shall nothing hurt your Soul. And he concludes, *that there is no other means to preserve Unity proper to the Church.* But questionless this means is most ineffectual; which both experience teacheth us (as I have just now shewed) and the very consideration also of the nature of the means. For this means must at last be applied by men, that is, by those to whom Nature has given as different Judgments in their Understandings, as affections in their Love and Wills. Well now, when this weak, this most fallible and most various understanding, has got into his

22 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

his hands the Rule, by which only every one is to be directed in Faith, what can we expect, but that, as every one's Judgment is different, so also will the Faith of every one be. And every one believing that to be evident which he judgeth to be so, every one will sincerely say that he brings evident demonstrations of Scripture, and therefore he contradicts public Authority upon as good ground as you did, when you (at your division from the *Roman Church*) did contradict, not only her Authority, but also the Public known Doctrine of all other Churches which God had visible, at that time, upon the face of the Earth. *Tertullian* wittily saith, *What was lawful to Valentinus was awful to the Valentinians.* As lawfully as *Luther, Zwinglius, Calvin,* and others did separate from all the Prelats and Pastors of the Church of their Age; So lawfully at the least the Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists may separate from them and their few new Prelats and Pastors, and may according to the example which these men gave them, make themselves Independents, and cast off this remnant of Dependency, not only of higher Prelats, but also of all inferior Curates: for this is but to go on consequently to the example given unto them.

5. But for the importance of the matter, I will further declare this by a clear example, which may hereafter be useful to us. Let us take an *Arian* Cobler, and give him one great Principle more of *D. Ferns*, *that his part is the negative*: For he denies the affirmative Doctrin of those who teach, that God the Son is of the very self same substance with his Father; and that consequently our Church must shew him evident Scripture for what we affirm. If you tell him, the great Council of *Nice* has unanimously declar'd the sense of these words in Scripture, *I and my Father am one thing*, to be this, That God the Son is one and the self same substance with his Father, tho' yet he be a different Person: Well, will he say, I reverence Councils very highly, yet I must peruse their Decrees, and consider how conformable they be to Scripture. I beginning to do this, began to ponder how God the Father and his Son are one thing; being they be quite different persons? And surely this different personality, in all reasons, should be a different thing. How then (said I) are they one thing? Is it not perhaps the true meaning of these words, that they are one thing only by affection, as I have often been told by our great Doctors? This I can easily understand; I will see a little further

24 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

further whether this Interpretation, conferr'd with other Texts of Scripture, may not be found to be very good. I conferr'd it with the Text, which one of our Doctors cited out of *John* 17. 21. where Christ prays to his Father *That all his Disciples may be one thing, as thou Father in me, and I in thee.* Here I marked that Christ demanded, that his Disciples *might be one thing, as he and his Father are one thing.* Now every body sees that Christ never begged, that his Disciples *might be one thing in substance with him.* Hence I manifestly conclude, that I now am not convinced of my negative Opinion, for which I have all human reasons; but contrariwise I bring for my Opinion the evident demonstration of Scripture, against the public Authority of the Council of *Nice.* Wherefore if the followers of that Council press me to make public Profession, That God the Son is of the same substance with his Father, I may and must gainsay them all. Good Doctor, either convince this *Arian* Cobler or give us better satisfaction why you deny, that these your Principles open a gap for Sectaries, and even such Sectaries as overthrow the foundations of true Religion, as you confess this *Arian* belief do's. And just as this Cobler proceeds in denying this Consubstantiation, so you proceed in denying

denying Transubstantiation. Only he who denies Consubstantiation, has incomparably stronger Reasons and better Authority of Scripture for himself. Of this review of Councils see *Sect. 18. n. 5, 6.*

6. A Third Reason, why we say Scripture not to be our only Judge, is, that our very Adversaries confels, no one Book of Scripture, nor no certain number of Canonical Books, to be our Judge: But they say the whole Canon, or all the Canonical Books together, make up the only Rule, by which we are to be wholly directed. Now if this be so, that you will have us judged by all Canonical Books, then you must agree to tell us, which Books for certain be those which belong to the making up the whole number of Canonical Books. For it is a most just request to ask of you, By what Judge you would have us to be judged? You say by all Canonical Books: Give us leave to ask how many, and which Books they be? Your English Bible thrusts out of the Canon, and placeth among the Apocrypha, some half a score Books which we hold for Canonical. Again, your English Bible takes into the Canon of Scriptures, divers Books which your *Lutheran Brethren* cast out; as the Epistle of *St. Paul* to the Hebrews, the Epistle of *St. James*, the Second Epistle of *St. Peter*, the Second

26 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

and third of St. *John*; the Epistle of St. *Jude*; the *Apocalyps* or Revelation. We then say unto you, agree at least first, by which Books you would have the Canon to be compleatly made up, and then press us by your arguments to be judged by them alone. This at least we have reason to say; but we conceive our selves also to have reason to exact of you, to demonstrate unto us, that the Books of *Machabees* (by which we prove Purgatory) and the other Books which you are pleas'd to discannon, do not belong to the making up of the true Canon. Yet when you have done this, or allow'd us all these Books for Canonical, we shall not have the number of Books requisite to make the full Canon. Hence follow's.

7. A fourth reason, that many, and very many of the Canonical Books of Scripture have quite perished, and not so much as appeared in the days of the very ancient Fathers: So that nothing but the names of these Books are come unto us. *Adamus Contzen* in his Proemial Questions to his Commentaries upon the 4 Gospels 2. 4. §. 8. do's not only affirm, but most solidly prove, that no fewer than twenty several Books of Scripture have thus wholly perished. *Serrarius* do's the same. I will give you the Names of some of these Books. In the Book of
Numbers

The Bible is not our Judge. 27

Numbers c. 21. v. 14. we read thus: It is said in the Book of the wars of the Lord. Where is this Book? It is quite perished. In the third Book of Kings (which you call the first) c. 4. v. 32. Solomon Spoke three thousand Proverbs: And his Canticles were a thousand and five. Where be these Books? What a small part have we of them? In the second Book of Chronicles c. 9. v. 29. it is said. Now the rest of the Acts of Solomon first and last, are they not written in the Book of Nathan the Prophet, and in the Prophecie of Ahijah and in the vision of Iddo? Where be these three several Prophets Books? They are all quite perished. And the first Book of Chron. ends with these words, Now the Acts of David the King first and last, behold be they not written in the Book of Samuel the Seer, and in the Book of Nathan the Prophet, and in the Book of Gad the Seer? Where also are these several Prophets Books? They are quite lost. In the last to the Colossians S. Paul commands to read in the Church the Epistle from Laodicia. Where is it? It appears not. He also in his first to the Corinthians C. 5. v. 9. saith, I wrote to you in an Epistle. Where is this Epistle to them which he wrote before the first that we have unto them? It appears not. St. Matthew (whose Hebrew Gospel is now quite lost) in his 27. Chap. v. 9. cites

28 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

words spoken by the Prophet *Jeremy*, which are not to be found in all *Jeremy* as we now have him. Wherefore part of *Jeremy* the Prophet is also perished, as *Contzen* on this place excellently proves out of *Chron.* 2. c. 35. v. 26. *St. Matthew* also C. 2. v. 23. saith, *It was spoken by the Prophets, He shall be called a Nazaren.* The Books of those Prophets who spoke this are also perished, for we find Christ never called a Nazaren in all the Prophets Books which we have. Whence *St. Chrysostom* writing on this place *Homil. 9. in Mat.* saith, *Many of the Prophetical manuments have perished; for the Jews being careless, and not only careless, but also impious, they have carelessly lost some of these Monuments: Others they have partly burned, partly torn in pieces.* So he. Now those Books which the Jews out of impious malice burned, or tore apieces, are most likely to have been such as they did see the Apostles. to cite most for the proof of Christian Doctrin; as also it appears by their making away the Prophets Books cited by *St. Matthew*. See *St. Justin* against *Tryphon*, shewing that the Jews did make away many Books of the Old Testament, that the New might not seem to agree with it, as it should.

8. Well then, by all this it is manifest, that many, and very many Books
of

The Bible is not our Judge. 29

of Scripture have quite perished, besides those many which you your selves thrust unjustly out of your Bible. Will you have us now, in all our Controversies about necessary points, be wholly judged by all the Books of the Scripture? Then produce them all, that we may know what is written in all of them. For who can doubt but many things, as necessary as others that are in the Books we have, were written in these Books which we have not? Especially the Jews maliciously being most likely to have destroyed those Books first, which contain'd the most cleer places for our Religion. Where is it written that all things necessary to be believed, are written in the Books which we now have? Cite me a Text proving this, and I have done. Nay, you your selves teach, that all the whole body of the Books of Scripture is required, to give us those points which are necessary to Salvation. And the reason is, because you cannot assign any particular Books, or particular number of particular Books containing clearly all these necessary points. Yea, we shall prove, that there are no fewer than twenty four necessary points, which are not contain'd in any of those Books of Scripture which we have, whether they were contain'd in the Books which have

C 3

perished,

30 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

perished, no man but a Prophet can tell; or if they were, then (now at least) since they are perished, we cannot know these necessary points by them. Yet, these points being necessary to be known, God must provide us of some other means to know them.

9. A fifth reason. If either all the Books of Scripture, or some particular number of them, had contain'd the only necessary direction, for every Man to guide himself by, in all points necessary to Salvation, it cannot be doubted, but the Apostles, who spent all their labors and lives, in seeking the Salvation of Souls, and who knew very well, that, on the one side true Faith in matters necessary for belief and practice, was wholly necessary to the Salvation of every one; and knew also on the other side (as you must say) that the only means appointed by God for their necessary direction in this necessary Faith, was the Scripture, and nothing but the Scripture, by which every Man was to judge for himself; it cannot, I say, be doubted but they (had this been true) would either themselves have procur'd the Scriptures to be put into such Tongues and Languages, as the vulgar People of so many different Nations use, and only understand; for without their understanding
the

the Scriptures, it is impossible to direct themselves by them; and without they direct themselves by them, it is impossible to be rightly directed to the knowledge of that Faith, without which it is impossible to please God. The Apostles knew this to the full as well as you, if it be true; And yet we could never hear, that they took so much as the least care by themselves, or charg'd their Successors to take the least care to turn the Scripture, either all, or that part which is so wholly necessary, into such Languages as the several People of these several Nations (which they converted) did use: neither could we ever hear, that their Successors (so very well instructed by them) did ever take the least care to do this, so wholly necessary to be done, if your Doctrin be true. Yet you all deny, that their immediate Successors did set forth our Latin vulgar Edition, which is the most antient of all Latin Editions, *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* living so long in *Rome* caus'd no part of the Bible to be translated into the *Romish* Language: yea, *St. Paul* writes to them in Greek.

10. Some answer, that the Apostles took this care, because they writ the greatest part of the New Testament in Greek. And then, they being put to prove that Greek was understood, either by all, or by the greater part of the World, they

32 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

prove this most pitifully, by only citing *Tully pro Archia Poëta*, saying, *Græca omnibus fere gentibus leguntur. Greek is read almost in all Nations.* I answer, that as we commonly say, That *Tully* and *Kirgil* in Latin, are read in all Nations; and yet our meaning only is, that the more Learned sort in all Nations read these Latin Books: So, in this sense, *Tully* may so much the easier be suppos'd to have said Greek was read *almost* in all Nations, because he added the word *almost* even then, when he deliver'd this his Saying in an encomiastical Oration, in which Orators make freest use of Amplifications, and Hyperbolical Exaggerations, ever without any restrictions at all; especially when such Amplifications be for their turn, as here it was for *Tully's* turn, because he was to shew that this Man (though a Greek Poet) could by his Greek Poetry make the Romans famous, Greek Poets being read, by the learn'd sort of the neighboring Nations, and the same among the Learn'd of those Nations being chiefly to be regarded. And either, in this usual sense, *Tully* must be understood; or else flat Scripture must be denied. For the Scripture, *Act. 2.* intending on set purpose to give us the names of several People, whose Languages were all different one from another, at the beginning

beginning of the Church, names *Pontus*, *Cappadocia*, *Asia (minor)*, *Phrygia*, *Pamphilia*, all which places are situated between that City, which now we call *Constantinople*, and the City of *Antioch*, in which Town *Tully*, saith that Poet, which he undertook to praise, was born. Within that compass also is *Galatia*, which *S. Jerom* testifies to have had a Language somewhat like to that of *Trevers*. Now, if even in these places, where a Man, by *Tully's* words, would most imagin the Greek Tongue to be the Vulgar Language, it is manifest (by Scripture it self) that it was not so; surely we have all reason to imagin, that in remoter parts, both in East, West, North, and South, it was in few places the vulgar Language in respect of the far greater part of the World. Call here to mind how much you use to cry out against us, for using our common Public Prayer in Latin, tho' this Language be so common among all well bred People; and yet this our Common Public Prayer is a thing only offer'd to God, for the People of all Nations; and not a thing spoken to the People of all Nations, for their necessary instruction, as you say all the Scripture was. And moreover, Mass is offer'd up by a Priest, who understands the Language in which he offers up these Public

34 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

Prayers: But the Scripture, especially the New Testament, is deliver'd to every one of the People (as you teach) for every one to judge by it for himself, what is necessary for him to believe, and to do, to work his Salvation; and this is his necessary direction appointed by God to be so. Why then do you not cry out much more against the Apostles, and their ill instructing their Successors in so important a point, as was the communicating or delivering to the People of all Nations, in such Languages as were known to all Nations vulgarly and commonly, that very Rule of Faith, so wholly necessary for their direction, that all other means are accounted by you fallible, and consequently insufficient to bring forth an infallible assent, such an one as true saving Faith must be. But the truth is, that the Apostles knew well enough, that Oral Tradition, joyn'd to the daily Profession of the Faith so deliver'd, and to the daily Practice, answerable to what they so profess'd, would abundantly suffice for the sufficient communicating of Gods Infallible Word to all Nations.

II. All this is confirm'd by this demonstration. The *Jews* in their Captivity at *Babylon* did wholly lose the vulgar use and knowledge of the old Hebrew
Tongue

Tongue in which the Law and Prophets were written, and ever after spoke Syriack; a Language mixt with Hebrew and Chaldean, and wonderful few by their private study did so much as understand Hebrew. This is testify'd by your own greatest Doctors of Antiquity, who now are setting forth that admirable Bible at London (of which I shall speak Sect. 4. n. 8.) in their introduction they say, *Certum est ante Christum nullam fuisse versionem Syram.* It is certain, that before Christs time (and some time after) there was no Scripture translated into the Syriack Language. So that for fourteen Generations the Jews had not the Bible in their own Vulgar Language: But the Law and Prophets were read in their Synagogue, and the Psalms were sung in in a Language which the People no more understood than they now understand Latin. This was done before Christs own Eyes, and he never found fault with it. An evident proof of the lawfulness of Prayer in an unknown Tongue, and that God gave not the Jews the Scripture only for their Rule or Judge; for then it would have been judg'd necessary to have been translated into Syriack, the only Tongue they understood. Let us go on. Yet before we proceed, let us note by the way; how soon you came to call your
Public

36 *The Bible not containing all points,*
Public Service into question, when
once you had got it in your vulgar Lan-
guage: every vulgar Fellow presumes to
censure it; yea it has in your Courts
been Arraign'd and Condemn'd; and is
so vulgarly contemn'd, that scarce any
Minister dares offer to read it. But we
must proceed to other Matters.

Seēt. 2.

*A Sixth Argument, That Scripture contains
not plainly all things necessary to be believ'd
or done to Salvation.*

This is here shew'd by Fourteen Examples.

DOCTOR Fern in his Seēt. 22. tells us :
*That Scripture contains all things of
themselves necessary to be believ'd or done to
Salvation: not expressly and in so many words,
but either so, or else, deducible thence by evi-
dent and sufficient consequence. And in his
Seēt. 26. What is necessary to Life and Faith
is for the most part plainly set down. I sup-
pose he says it is so, for the most part, be-
cause sometimes it is only deducible by
consequence, which must be evident and
clear; as a little after he says. And yet
for fear all this should come short, he
presently adds, That things thus necessary
are not deducible, all by every one that reads:*
but

cannot be our Judge in all points. 37

but it is enough if done by the Pastors and Guides which God appointed in his Church to that purpose, using the means that are needful to that purpose; such as is attention and diligence in search of the Scripture, collation of places, and observing the connections; also sincerity and impartiality in the Collection or Deductions which they make; also Prayer and Devotion for assistance in the Work. Thus he, very discomfortably for the far greater part of the World, who (tho' most unlearn'd) are most preposterously by Protestant Doctors invited; yea declar'd to be commanded, to read the Scriptures, to the end they may plainly know by themselves what is necessary for them to be believ'd and done to Salvation; and yet here they are plainly told, that these necessary things are not all, but only for the most part, plainly set down; and tho' they be deducible from Scripture, yet they be not all deducible by every one that reads; but it is enough if done by their Pastors and Guides. What by them all? No, not by them all, but only such as have used all these great diligences here express'd: To which he ought to have added several things more, as perfect skill in Greek and Hebrew, with the perusal of the true, and certainly true Originals; which Diligences, with all these Conditions, one Minister amongst one

38. *The Bible not containing all points,*
one hundred useth not, and those, who
have us'd it, cannot be evidently known
by the People to have us'd them; and
tho' they could be known to have done
so, yet they should be known to have us'd
means that are fallible. How then grow
these Consequences to be *evident*? Yet all
the People are all to hold such Conse-
quences evidently deduc'd; and yet with-
out they themselves use these means (im-
possible unto them) they cannot know
the evidence of this Deduction. For
how should they know it evidently?
And yet again, these poor good People
are most preposterously taught, to prefer
the Doctrin of their Ministers, thus and
only thus deduc'd, (even according to
their own confession) before the quite
contrary Consequences deduc'd by in-
comparable better means: For what our
Church teacheth in her General Coun-
cils, is deduc'd from Gods Word by
most Skilful, and most Learned Prelates
assembled from all parts of the World,
bringing with them the best Scholars
that can be got by them in the World:
All chiefly having regard to what was
first deliver'd with their first Faith.
Moreover all the Christian World is still
helping them by their Prayers all the
time they are assembled. Again the ve-
ry conference of such Men with one ano-
ther

cannot be our judge in all points. 39

ther, is a thing wonderfully helping to the finding out Truth; to say nothing of the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost, made far surer, by promise of Christ to them, than to any Private Ministers: What then more unreasonable than to forsake them, to follow these?

2. But let us go on. The World consists of people, commonly not very learned: For these men, God must have provided some way, to know clearly what they are obliged to believe, and to do for their salvation. For many things which are to be believed, are most hard to understand: And many things must be practised, which are very hard to be done. And the belief and practice of these things must oblige all the World, as long as the same shall continue. Now to oblige all for ever to this without giving them means to know plainly and clearly, what they should believe or do, had been a thing unreasonable, in so sweet a Providence, as that of our Heavenly Father is. This obligation then in every particular point which is necessarily to be believed, and done by us, for the obtaining Heaven and avoiding Hell, must be clearly intimated to us all, even in all and every one of these particulars. The means, by which this is only
to

40 *The Bible not containing all points,*
to be done, is the Scripture taken by it
self alone, as all you Protestants teach :
Wherefore an unavoidable necessity do's
fall upon you, to affirm, *That all things*
necessary to be believed, or done, are plainly
set down in Scripture : And consequently
what is not so delivered, is thereby suf-
ficiently signified not to be necessary. As
for your limitations, in declaring these
words, *plainly set down,* we shall (besides
what we have already said) say much
more in the end of this Section and Sect.
7. Now we must give a distinct declara-
tion of this your opinion, which per force
must be held by all kind of Protestants ;
for necessity forceth them, who disagree
so often, here wholly to agree. First
then, let us declare those first words of
their assertion, *All things necessary to be*
believed, or done. These words must of
necessity be understood so, that all things
are plainly set down in Scripture, which
are thus necessary : *First,* to the universal
Church, as it is a Community ; *Secondly,*
all things which are necessary to all such
states, and degrees, as must needs be in
so vastly diffused a Community ; and
Thirdly, all things which are thus neces-
sary, to every single person, bound to be
of this Community. As for *the first* ; the
Church being intended by Christ to be a
Community diffused through the whole
World,

cannot be our Judge in all points. 41

World, and intended to be continued to the end of the World; such a Community as this is, must, by infallible Authority, be plainly told many things; wholly necessary for her direction, and perpetual preservation, which no one of you can shew to be plainly set down in Scripture.

3. As first, She must by infallible Authority be plainly told in what manner she is, in all times and places, to be provided of Lawful Pastors, and that with perpetual succession. As, whether it be in her power only to appoint the manner of choosing these Pastors? Or they may be appointed her by meer Laymen, having secular Authority: And that, whether this secular Authority be lawfully obtained, or unlawfully usurped? The knowledge of this is necessary: For we are bid, not to hear those Pastors which enter not by the Door.

4. Secondly, In like manner, she must be told what power these Pastors have in respect of one another: Whether there be one, or none at all, to have supreme Authority over the rest? And who they be? Or whether they be all equal, so that the one cannot be judged, corrected, or deposed by the other, or by the secular Magistrate? Or how many of these Pastors, must concur to the lawful judging, correcting, or deposing of these Pastors?

42 The Bible not containing all points,

Pastors? Pastors have such a main influence into their Flocks, that, in so vast a Community, scarce any thing is more necessary, than due and Lawful subordination among them, legally appointed, legally observed. What plain Text of Scripture tells her how this is to be done?

5. Thirdly, In like manner, she must be told, what power these Pastors have over the Laymen, be they Emperors, Kings, or other Magistrates, or common People? What Laws any of these Pastors severally taken, can make? And how strictly these Laws oblige? How just the Censures be, which are imposed for the breach of them? All which things are of apparent necessity for the direction of the Church, that every one of these Pastors may know what in conscience he can, and ought to do, not to exceed his power, or not to be defective in his duty.

6. Fourthly, She must in like manner be told that which so mainly concerns her, in point of universal government, by the highest Tribunal upon Earth; which Tribunal Protestants acknowledge to be Lawful general Councils, and then national Councils. For upon the lawfulness of national Councils, and upon their legal power (even in matters of making so great a change of Religion, as was made by bringing in Protestant Religion, in place

cannot be our judge in all points. 43

place of the Roman Faith, and dividing from the whole World) depends wholly the Lawfulness of the English Division from the Church of Rome, according to the great Defenders thereof D. Hammond and D. Ferne, who Sect. 9. Saith; *A national Church hath its judgment within it self, for the receiving, and holding the definitions and practices of the Church general: And may have possibly just cause of dissenting (he means in matters of Faith) and reforming; and can do it regularly, according to the way of the Church by Provincial Synods. And this is considerable in the English Reformation.* So he here; and again more fully in his new Book. C. 1. num. 24. against D. Champny. A strange, though a necessary contradiction, in places so very near of so small a Book, to lay for one ground of their Faith, *That all things necessary must be evidently deduced from Scripture; and that, against public Authority evident demonstration of Scripture must be brought in points of dissent* (as I shewed out of his 13. Sect.) And yet here to make this Authority of a national Synod to be so very great, without shewing any single Text of Scripture, so much as obscurely intimating any such thing: Yea, a Doctor could not but evidently know, that in all Scripture, there is no where any mention of the Authority of national Synods, especially

44 *The Bible not containing all points,*
specially in so mainly important matters
for the Salvation of a whole Nation. Al-
so a Doctor could not but know, that nei-
ther the name of such a Synod; nor the
thing signified by this name; were so
much as contain'd in the Bible. What
then is this but to speak just what is for
the present turn? Doctor, this Authori-
ty of national Synods, being made by
you the foundation of your regularly re-
forming, (tho' perhaps out of policy to
oppose these daily born Sects) should
have been proved by you, by evident
demonstration of Scripture, to be so great,
that it may Lawfully stand in oppositi-
on to all Churches upon the face of the
whole Earth. Now as the salvation of
a whole Nation is so nearly concern'd in
the true, or usurped Authority of a na-
tional Synod, or Council; so the salva-
tion of all Nations is no less concern'd in
the true, or usurped Authority of a gene-
ral Council. And yet *first*, the Scripture
neither tells you, who must of necessity
be called to this Council, to make the
calling lawful. *Nor Secondly*, who must
of necessity be assembled; to make the
assembly full and lawful. Or how many
may suffice. *Nor Thirdly*, who, or how
many of those, who are assembled, must
consent to the voting of a Decree, or de-
finition before it obligeth. *Nor Fourthly*,
who

cannot be our judge in all points. 45

who must call these men. Or what power he has to force them by Censures to appear at the time, and place appointed, and to continue there. Or whether any one be bound to come, except those who please, and when they please. *Nor Fifthly*, who must preside in this assembly. *Nor Sixthly*, what power this assembly has to declare all doubts in Faith. Or whether it can impose Precepts under pain of damnation. For example, commanding all under this penalty to keep Christmas day, Ascension day, and to communicate once a year, to fast on Christmas Eve, yea to fast a whole Lent. Or whether, after all their Decrees, every one, without Sin, may leave all they command in these, or the like matters, quite undone at his pleasure. Here you see six things all mainly necessary to be known by the Church, as a Community; none of which are plainly told her in Scripture. These six points, added to the former three, make nine. Let us then proceed.

7. Tenthly, This Community or Church must also be plainly told, what public service her Pastors may, and ought to perform in the Church. Whether they may have none at all, as now the fashion is? Or whether they may have such an one as is different, even in the prime substance, from all the World,

46 *The Bible not containing all points,*
as the fashion was heretofore? For it cannot but be a thing highly importing, in a whole Community, to retain such or such a public service as was, at least in substance, appointed by the Apostles; and not to make what changes private Men or National Synods please, nor to discard all public Service: Yea, that very Service which all Christians of all Nations, (which were not confessed Heretics) every where us'd; as appears by all their most ancient Service-Books which you could find in any Corner of Christendom. The beginning of the substantial things in this Liturgy, or Public Service, can never be found out, by all diligent search us'd by Protestants this last hundred years; tho' the time of every little accidental change be extant in many Records, which would not have fail'd to Record the beginnings of the substance of the Liturgy, had it had any beginning different from that common beginning, of all practices of Christian Religion brought in by the Apostles.

8. Eleventhly, The Church is primarily concern'd in the use lawful or unlawful of Sacraments, and therefore this (as all other things necessary for her) should be plainly taught her in Scripture: And yet in all Scripture she can neither find
the

cannot be our Judge in all points. 47

the Name of Sacrament in this sense which we, and our Adversaries take it, nor any Rule to direct her to know what a Sacrament is? Or what is requir'd to the lawful Administration of true Sacraments? which our Adversaries hold to be so necessary to the True Church, that in their *Tenth Article*, they make it one of their two certain signs and marks, by which the True Church may always be known from the False Church; and yet (O preposterous proceedings!) they, who will have all necessary things set down plainly in Scripture, know very well that many necessary things, concerning the true use of Sacraments, are no where express'd therein, as no one of those things are which I have now nam'd, nor many other things concerning their true use; for Example, By whom is every Sacrament necessarily to be administred? Whether must the Ministers of all Sacraments of necessity have any Orders, or none at all? And what Order must they have, by whom, and in what manner, or in what form must these Sacraments be conferr'd? or whether are we bound to use these Sacraments only when we list, and as often, or as seldom as we list? For nothing of this point is deliver'd in Scripture, nor of the other things I just now nam'd;
whence

48 *The Bible not containing all points,*

whence very many, and very important differences are amongst us; all undecidable by Scripture, which is so deeply silent in all these points. Hence some of you, for ordering Priests and Deacons, require Bishops Ordain'd, and Ordaining with such a form as never Antiquity usd; and without these Priests, they say, there is no lawful administering Sacraments, at least in public: Yea, tho' they hold Matrimony no Sacrament, yet we see a World make scruple about the lawfulness of it, except by Ordain'd Ministers, or at least Ticket Ministers: A thing manifestly not express'd in Scripture, to which notwithstanding they all contend nothing to be added. Others therefore far more consequently answer, That what is not plainly set down in Scripture, is thereby signify'd not to be necessary; but it is not plainly set down in Scripture, that of necessity Priests are to be so Ordain'd, or are only to Administer Sacraments, or that they only should have power to bless the Bread; for where is this written? For Christ, after he had taken the Wine, said, *Drink you all;* which words import a Command to Laymen to drink (as you say;) why therefore do not these words, *Do you this,* concern all Lay People as well as your Priests, who can shew no better Authority

rity why they only should bless the Bread and Wine? You differ also, whether the Bread of necessity must be of Wheat or Barly, Oats or Pease? In Baptism, some will have such and such words to be necessary; others will allow Baptism in the name of Christ alone; others will say no words at all are necessary. For (say they) when our Savior would have his Apostles *to ask in his Name*, Jo. 16. 23, 24. he is not to be understood, that of necessity they should use any words; so when he bid them *Go and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, &c.* Matt. 28. he is not necessarily and plainly to be so understood, as if he did bid them to use any words at all, for this is not set down in Scripture; and what is not plainly set down in Scripture is thereby held by you unnecessary. Lo here in this number, how many other things have been set down by me, all so necessary to the Church, *as a Community*; and yet not plainly told her by the Scripture? But let all these many things go to make up an even Dozen. This Dozen proves twelve times over what I said of the Church taken as a Community.

9. But most of these things also are necessary to be known by some peculiar states of Persons, which must of necessity

50 *The Bible not containing all points,*
ty be in this Community: For in it there
must be lawful Pastors, who cannot
know themselves to be lawful Pastors, nor
carry themselves for such, unless they
know themselves to be sent by lawful Au-
thority; because (according to your Do-
ctrine), the other (and the only other)
mark of the true Church, is set down in
your Tenth Article to be the true Preach-
ing of the Word of God. *But how shall*
they preach unless they be (lawfully) sent?
Rom. 10. 15. They must know also,
whether according to Gods Ordinance,
any other be their Superiors to judge
them, correct them, &c, that so they
may discharge their Duty in Obeying
them. They must know the Bounds
and Limits of their Power over some, or
all Lay-men. They must know what
their Duty is to see the Decrees of Natio-
nal or General Councils observ'd, when
these Councils are lawful; and conse-
quently, they must be furnish'd with suf-
ficient means to know the lawfulness of
them; which they can never be, but by
knowing those six things specify'd above
N. 6. no one of which six things are
clearly told them by any Scripture. To
these Pastors also it belongs to perform
the Public Service in due manner, and to
teach the People when they are bound,
to assist at it; and consequently they of
necessity

cannot be our Judge in all points. 51

necessity must be told which is the Public Service us'd by the Apostles, and their Successors instructed by them to use it. For who can believe they us'd none at all, tho' what they us'd be no otherwise written than in the public practice of, not one, but as many Nations as they converted; all which us'd Liturgies containing the Essence and Substance of a true Sacrifice. These Pastors also must know all that in the last number we said to belong to the wholly necessary knowledge of true Sacraments: They must know, for example, whether they may permit Women to Baptize, in case of necessity; as I shall shew all Antiquity to have held and practis'd, tho' there be no such thing clearly set down in Scripture; and so for other things. And thus much for Clergy-men, and their State. Marriage is also a state of Millions of Laymen, and to which so many of them, not yet married, do pretend: Now some things under pain of Damnation must be practis'd, and consequently known by these Men, which notwithstanding are not plainly told them in Scripture; As, whether they may have two Wives, or no, at one time? We all hold this Damnable, and yet this Obligation of having but one (so hard to many) is no where clearly, and manifestly

52. *The Bible not containing all points,*
festly set down in any Scripture. Secondly, It is Damnable to them to Marry within such and such Degrees of Kindred, as we all hold : Where are these Degrees clearly told us in the New Scripture ? If we are to practise what is in the Old Testament, Men may at once have one or more Wives ; against which you have no clear Text in all the New Testament. I might add, that it is necessary to those who marry, to know whether it be lawful to do so without a Priest, there being no such thing intimated in Scripture ; according to which Holy and Mysterious things are known to have been lawfully perform'd by the Ministry of Lay-men. For the killing the Pascal Lamb was both Holy and Mysterious, and yet done by Lay-men. Why may not then Marriage be perform'd without a Priest ? Add now these two or three to the former Dozen, and you have at least Fourteen several things, the knowledge of which are all necessary to Men of several States in the Church ; and yet no where set down in plain Scripture. I say here nothing of the Obligation which Parents have, to send their Children to be Baptiz'd in due time, because of the Obligation of Baptizing Children we shall speak hereafter, *Sett. 8. N. 3.* as also of sending them to such who can lawfully

cannot be our Judge in all points. 53

fully administer Baptism; of which I have said something.

10. Lastly, speaking of all in general, whatsoever they be, many of the things now specify'd, must, under pain of Damnation be known by them, that they may practise their necessary dutie which obliges all, and every one to be of a Church which has lawful Pastors, and which hath lawful Priests, Ordain'd, with the matter and form which is necessary, by true Bishops, and not false ones, and the Preachers of which Church must have true mission. All must know also, how far they are bound to obey these their lawful Pastors, both with Interior Submission of Judgment in some cases, and also Exterior Conformity in others. They all must know themselves to be of a Church where God is publicly serv'd, with that Public Service which the Apostles brought into the Church, and commended to their Successors. Every one is bound not to Work upon the *Sundays*, as we will shew, tho' neither this, nor yet many other things (of which we shall speak in many of the next Sections) be plainly set down in any Scripture. Here we have had above fourteen of these things specify'd, only for the full declaration of these words, *Necessary to Salvation*: All which you say

54 *The Bible not containing all points,*
are plainly set down in Scripture.

11. Let us now declare these words,
Plainly set down in Scripture; that all may
plainly see how many more great new
difficulties spring from them: *The first*
difficulty (clear'd by no plain Scripture)
is, Whether the Book of Scripture, in
which such a Point is set down, be Gods
Word, or no; as when it is written in
the Book of *Toby*, *Judith*, the *Machabees*,
the *Apocalyps*? *The second difficulty*, clear'd
also by no plain Scripture, is, Whether,
tho' such a Book be Gods Word, yet I
be secur'd, that it has not been corrup-
ted in the Chapter or Verse, expressing
the Point in Controversie. *The third*
difficulty, clear'd plainly by no Scripture
is, that these words, on which the Con-
troversie depends, be infallibly taken in
this place in their Common or usual
sense, or perhaps taken Figuratively, or
spoken mystically of some other thing.
For how is it possible, by Scripture on-
ly, to come to have an infallible know-
ledge of this, on which the Controver-
sie wholly depends? being this depends
meerly on the inward Free-will of God,
who perhaps would use only the plain
vulgar Sense of these Words in this
place, perhaps would use them only Fi-
guratively, or only Mystically. To
know this secret Free-will of God, and
that

cannot be our Judge in all points. 55

that infallibly, I must have such a Revelation, or such an assistance of the Holy Ghost, as you will not allow to the Church represented in a Council, and therefore it cannot be prudently allowable to any private Man; neither can any private Man shew plain Scripture for his particular pretence, to know infallibly this secret Will of God. *A fourth difficulty* (not to be cleared by plain Scripture) is, that after I have perused the whole Scripture, purposely to know what I am bound of necessity to believe and do, for my Salvation; I find no where plainly told me, that I am only to believe, and do that only which is plainly told me in Scripture; so that perhaps I may be bound both to believe, and do somewhat not expressed clearly in Scripture, especially it not being clear, plain and manifest by Scripture, that I am not to hear the Church, nor admit of unwritten Traditions, but stand only to what is written. But of these *four difficulties*, we shall speak fully in the following Sections.

12. Now we must consider how these words, *Plainly set down in Scripture*, be yet liable to a *fifth difficulty*; which is, that men of quite contrary persuasions in Faith, say, that such a Text says plainly this; another says that it says plainly no

56 *The Bible not containing all points*, such thing; yea, that it says the plain contrary: witness those words, *This is my Body*; which as you bring it about, must plainly signifie, *this is not my Body*. And thus we contend whether Scripture be plain and clear; which makes it plain and clear, that Scripture, tho submitted to by us both, endeth neither of our differences in most important matters.

13. *A sixth difficulty* (and a most fruitful Mother of a number of difficulties) ariseth from your own explications, and declarations, and modifications, and limitations, and as good as annihilations, by which you so restrain this Principle; which you strain so much at other times, to make it reach home to all points necessary, by a clear decision of them all, even in any necessary controversie. Dr. Fern, with whose words I began this Section, tells us, that all things necessary are not so plainly set down; that every one who reads Scripture, can manifestly draw out of it the knowledge of all points that are necessary; but (says he) *it is enough, if it be done by the Ministers*. So little plain dealing there is in calling, or miscalling that thing *plain*; which plainly proves it self not to be so, by not being *plain* to any, who are not as knowing men as their Ministers. All
Women

cannot be our Judge in all points. 57

Women (who so desperately read, and cite the Bible) may now despair of knowing, by their own reading, even those very things which are necessary to salvation. This, they now tell you, must be done for you by Ministers, from whom if you will have it, you must take it on their word: For you are a reprobate if you tell them their plain deductions be not plain nor conformable to Scripture; tho' you may be one of the Elect, and yet say so much against what whole general Councils have deduced from Scripture. But this which they would have you believe to be plainly set down, they tell you cannot be found out to be so by all kind of Ministers, *but only by such* (point them out with your finger if you can) as use all these things following. 1. *Attention.* 2. *Diligence in search of the Scripture.* 3. *Collation of places.* 4. *Observing the connexions.* 5. *Sincerity and impartiality.* 6. *Prayer and Devotion for assistance in the work.* To all which you must ever put this *Notandum*, that neither you can tell, when they have used these things sufficiently, to come to the plain and wholly necessary truth; nor they can tell whether there has not crept in some error in the use of these means, spoiling all. Neither will the use of these only suffice: Skill in Greek, and deep

58 *The Bible not containing all points,*
skill, is required for perusing the New
Testament, and no less skill in Hebrew
for the Old. To these still fallible Rules,
so many more are to be added out of
your own Divines; that your great Di-
vine Sanchius (*de Sacra Scriptura* Col. 409)
assigns no fewer than Nineteen Rules, besides
the *having the Spirit of God* (quite forgot
by Dr. Fern) and besides *understanding*
the words and places of Scripture. No won-
der then that your learned Scharpius (*in*
cursu Theologico de Scriptoribus, *Controvers.* 8.
P. 44.) assigns full twenty Rules for the
understanding of Scripture; which, un-
less they be kept, we cannot but err, as he
says. I wonder how many more Rules
are necessary for ordinary understanding
men, to know that you have not erred
in the use of all these twenty Rules,
especially he and others exacting, a-
mong other Rules, to know *Original Lan-*
guages, to discuss the *Words and Hebraisms*.
Now, dear Reader, as thou lovest thy
Soul, stand here a little, and ponder
how thy Ministers abuse thee, which
do all of them teach this Doctrin (de-
liver'd by D. Fern, in *Seet.* 8. 9, 10, 11.
and 14. in these words, the place last
cited) *If you will be with us, you shall see*
what you do. We require your obedience to
what we demonstrate to be Gods will. The
Church of Rome (because forsooth, she
will

cannot be our Judge in all points. 59

will have you use the better light of Counsels illuminated by the Holy Ghost) *saieth, if you will come to me, you must put out your Eyes.* So he, so all the rest do plainly cheat thee, when they tell thee, *thou shalt with thy own eyes see all things plainly set down out in Scripture:* For now when they come to their tryal, they tell thee thou must trust Ministers, and not all, but such as can and really do use twenty hard Rules. But of this more *Sect. 7. N. 3.* Here I only beseech thee to tell me, how thou canst come to think that he, who for our Salvation gave his precious Blood, would not give us also some more plain Rule to direct us to the infallible belief of that, which he obliges us to believe under pain of damnation. See my Preface *Num. 2. 3.* Dear Lord! Is this that was promised for an extraordinary favour (not yet granted) *when God himself should come and save us, and give us a way, so surpassing all former ways. A way so direct unto us, that Fools cannot err by it:* For surely wise, and very wise men know neither Greek nor Hebrew, nor the means how to know that those, who know these Languages, have duly used their knowledge, and the other odd nineteen Rules, *which unless they are kept, we cannot but err.* See also *Sect. 7.* Here Protestants with weeping eyes may say, what

60 *The Bible not containing all points,
what Juvenal did sing, O quis custodiet
ipso Custodes!*

*What Rules to men short-sighted given shall be,
To know when Overseers over-see?*

Sect. 3.

*A seventh Argument. By Scripture we know
not which Books are Canonical Scripture,
which not.*

*Neither is Scripture known to be Gods word
by its own Light; wherefore Protestants
do not believe Scripture with Divine
Faith.*

THe force of this Argument briefly is
this. If Scripture were our only
Rule of belief, it would tell us all things
necessarily to be believed: It do's not
tell us what Books be the only true
Word of God, which is a point most ne-
cessary to be believed: It is not therefore
our only Rule of Belief. Here you see
a 50th necessary, and most necessary
point, not plainly set down in Scripture.
*Luther denies the Apocalyps, the Epistle to
the Hebrews, the Epistle of S. James, and
other parts of Scripture, to be true Scrip-
ture; what Text tells him plainly he
must believe the contrary? We hold
some half a score Books to be true Scrip-
ture,*

cannot be our Judge in all points. 61

ture, which you hold *Apocrypha*: what Scripture or one single syllable of Scripture, tells us we hold false and you true? Cite that Text, and we yield. If you cannot cite that Text, then yield your selves to believe many, and so very many parts of Scripture to be Gods Word, which by no one single Text of Scripture, you can prove to be so. Tell me then, I pray, tell me, as you tender your own and my salvation, upon what ground you believe them to be so? You believe all things for the saying of true Scripture: Why do you believe the Scripture to be Scripture and Gods Word? Not upon any Text, for you have not one: And yet you believe this infallibly. What other ground have you, besides Texts of Scripture, able to support an infallible belief? Is the tradition of the Church to be relied upon in so great a matter? Then much more may it be relied upon in lesser matters. But if she be fallible in the delivery of her Traditions, how can I, upon her Authority, ground an infallible assent to the belief of all the Books of Scripture, being Gods certain Word? For this is a very hard point, because many of them contain things of themselves very incredible, as that the personality of God the Father should be all one thing with the Divine Essence;
and

62 *The Bible not containing all points,*
and that the personality of God the Son,
should not be all one thing with the per-
sonality of God the Father; and yet
be all one thing with the Divine Ef-
fence, which Divine Essence is all one
thing with the personality of God the
Father. That the Serpent should speak
to Eve; that all the World should be
excluded Heaven for one mans eating an
Apple. Is not that Authority, which
is able to support the infallible belief of
Books, which contain things so hard to
believe, able also to support the in-
fallible belief of things far less incredi-
ble, as Purgatory, Prayer to Saints,
an inferior worship of Images, in respect
of the persons they represent? Have
you any text to Tell me, that I must be-
lieve the Church in this most hard
and important matter, (to wit in this
matter, that such and such Books are
infallibly Gods Word) and that I must
not believe her in lesser matters? Give
me this Text, or confess that you
voluntarily believe a most huge
hard point, on which all your belief
in all other points must rely, without
any single Text of Scripture.

2. Dr. *Fern*, to prevent this argument,
puts yet a new limitation to the common
assertion of Protestants; that all things
necessary are plainly set down in Scrip-
ture.

cannot be our Judge in all points. 63
ture, For saith he, Sect. 13. *We say the
Scripture contains all the material objects of
Faith necessary to Salvation; that is, All
things that had been necessary for Christians
to believe and do, tho there had been no Scrip-
ture.* Whence Sect. 24. he, out of this
Principle, answers my Objection thus,
*That to believe Scripture to be the word of
God, is not of those material Objects of Faith
which we say are contained in Scripture, and
are such as had been necessary for Christians to
believe, tho there had been no Scripture.* And
then he proves the impossibility that
there is, that Scripture should sufficient-
ly tell us which Books be infallibly Gods
Word, and that therefore we must sup-
pose universal Tradition still to bring it
down to us. But Sir, you mark not
how pitifully you undo that very prime
Doctrin of yours, which forceth you
all to maintain, That all things necessa-
ry, are plainly set down in Scripture;
to wit, That (according to you) Scrip-
ture is given us by God, to be our on-
ly direction, in all that we must neces-
sarily believe and do for Salvation; for
if this Doctrin must pass among all for
so very true, that it must be imbraced
by the belief of all, before they can
wisely say, *In this Bible only we are to find
all necessary truth;* It follows then most
undoubtedly upon Gods giving us the Bi-
ble

64 *The Bible not containing all points,*
ble, to be taken by us as our only Rule,
that there must needs arise a necessity of
our believing something which we should
not have been bound to believe, if there
had been no Scripture written. For there
must arise a necessity of believing this
very Doctrin of yours, that the written
Word of God is given us for our only di-
rection in the points aforesaid; Or else
no man is bound to believe this, and to
admit of Scripture only for his Rule.
For nothing can be more sure, than that
this Doctrin ha's not universal Tradition,
still to bring it down to us: There-
fore either this Doctrin is most false (as
really it is) or most false it is, that we up-
on the writing of Scripture, are only
obliged to believe that, to the belief of
which, we should only have been obliged
tho' there had been no Scripture. For
what say you to this argument? True
Faith is necessary to Salvation, there-
fore the only Rule guiding us to true Faith,
must of necessity be known assuredly by
us. Because, without the guidance of
this Rule, we have no assured means (as
you say) to true Faith: But the only true
Books of Scripture, are the only Rule
guiding us to true Faith, as you all teach:
therefore we must have an infallible as-
surance of these true Books. Again, the
more impossible it is for Scripture to in-
form

cannot be our Judge in all points. 65

form us sufficiently which Books are Scripture, which not, and that infallibly; the more certain it is, that just as this most important point of all points, and the hardest of them all (for it contains all the points that are most hard in our Faith) can be made infallibly assured unto us without Scripture; so other points also may be, as Purgatory, Prayer to Saints, &c. And therefore these other less hard points may be as infallibly, by the Tradition of the same Church, assured unto us. For if Tradition can support an infallible assent to the hardest points, it can support the like assent to the less hard. He that can carry a hundred pound weight, can carry three or fourscore pound weight.

3. Hence it is that Dr. *Fern*, in the same place, is forced to fly to that paradoxical opinion, to which nothing but desperation of escaping any other way, has driven him and his Protestant Brethren. Thus then he says, *Scripture being received upon such Tradition, it discovers it self to be divine by its own light, or those internal arguments which appear in it to those who are versed in it.* Which others express thus; The Canonical Books are worthy to be believed for themselves; as we assent to the first Principles by their own light, so we do assent to Scripture to be the

66 *The Bible not containing all points,*
the Word of God, through the help of
the Spirit of God; as by its own light.
The Canonical Books bear witness of
themselves, they carry their own light,
by which we may see them to be Gods
Word; as we see the Sun, to be the Sun, by
its own light; so they.

4. We must then first speak a word
of this Tradition, which Dr. *Fern* call'd
Universal Tradition, that is, the Tradition
of the whole Church, which you all say
is fallible, and so you must not rest
upon it with an infallible assent, but
take it as a prudent motive perswading
such Books, as you hold to be Canonical,
to be Gods Word, which you believe
to be so for itself. But Sir, it is most false,
that *Universal Tradition* ha's deliver'd just
that number of Books, and those Books
which you hold, to belong to the true
Canon. The Council of *Laodicea* (in
which you us'd to boast your Canon to
be contain'd) omits the *Apocalyps* or
Revelations; and besides *Ruffinus*, you
will not find one ancient Writer, who ei-
ther puts not fewer or more Books in the
Canon than you do. Our Canon you
deny, and discard some half a score
Books out of it. Yet ours is the only
Canon which can claim a sufficient Tra-
dition, as I shall here shew *Num. II.*
And as for the Council of *Laodicea*, it is
far.

cannot be our Judge in all points. 67

far from being against us, for it defines indeed such Books to belong to the Canon of Scripture: but it do's not exclude any one of those, which also afterward, when due examin was made, were found deliver'd, if not with as full, yet with a Tradition sufficiently full; as you may see in the third Council of *Carthage*, to which *S. Austin* subscribed in Person. An evident Proof of this is, that the *Sixth* General Council do's confirm both this Council of *Laodicea*, and that very Council of *Carthage*, which by Name defin'd all the Books, set down in our Canon, to be God's Word: See *Num. II.* And then tell me with what face you can so much as pretend to *Universal Tradition*, for admitting your Bible: a Bible, putting among the *Apocrypha* so many Books, flatly against the Tradition of the precedent 12. hundred years. If this Tradition be a prudent inducement to imbrace what it commend's, then it induceth us to imbrace half a score Books more than you put in your Canon: If it be not a prudent inducement, it helps you nothing. If you fly to the Tradition of the Church only of the first four hundred years, remember that the Council of *Carthage*, just after the end of those years, alledg'd the *Ancient Tradition of their Fathers*, which they indged sufficient

68 *The Bible not containing all points,*
sufficient for defining our Canon. They,
who were so near those first four hun-
dred years, knew far better the more
universal Tradition of that Age, than
we can 12. hundred years after it. True
it is (nothing being defined as then)
private Doctors were free to follow
what they judged to be truest : And
as you find them varying from our
Canon, some in some Books, some in
others; so you will find them varying
from one another, and varying also
from you. For in those first four hun-
dred years *Melitus* and *Naxianzen* ex-
cluded the Book of *Ester*, which you
add. *Origen* doubts of the Epistle to
the *Hebrews*, of the Second of *St. Peter*,
of the first and second of *St. John*. *St. Cy-
prian* and *Naxianzen* leave the *Apocalyp-
s* or *Revelations* out of their Canon. *Euse-
bius* doubts of it. Only *Ruffinus* agrees
just with you. *Doth he make alone a suf-
ficiently Universal Tradition from Christs time
to this?* Now then all of you, by refus-
ing the Canon commended by the Tra-
dition of our Church; are left to the
sagacity of your own Noses, to hunt out
that most important and infallible cer-
tain truth of the true Canon of Scrip-
ture.

5. Here we must examin what help
you will have by the true Books of Scrip-
ture,

ture, which you say carry their own light with them, by which they may be as clearly seen to be Gods Word, as the Sun by its own light. For to the truth of this strange Paradox, explicated as above, you have brought the whole substance of your Faith, which must all fall to the ground, to be trodden upon by the *Socinians*, if this groundless ground holds not sure: Because you believe all other particular points relying upon Scripture only; All the Scripture you believe relying on this ground only, that you know by the very reading of such a Book, that this Book is as evidently Gods Word, by a certain light which the reading of it (with Spirit) produces, as you see the Sun by its light. Indeed you have brought your Religion to as pitiful a case as your greatest enemies could wish it in.

6. First then this ground (upon which you ground all) is accounted a plain foolish ground, by your own renowned *Chillingworth*. I say, your own; for the most learned of both your Universities have owned, and highly magnified his Book, notwithstanding his scornful language concerning this ground of your whole Religion. *Chillingworth* then (p. 69. n. 49.) answering these words of his adversary, *That the divinity of a writing cannot be known by it self alone, but by some*
intrinsic

70 *The Bible not containing all points, intrinsecal Authority:* Reply's thus; *This you need not prove: For no wise man deny's it. And Mr. Hooker (esteemed the learnedst Protestant which ever put Pen to Paper) writes thus; Of things necessary, the very chiefest is to know what Books we are to esteem holy, which point is confessed impossible for the Scripture it self to teach. So he Eccl. Pol. L. 1. S. 14. Pag. 86. And Dr. Corvelin his defence, Arr. 4. P. 31: It is not the word of God which do's or can assure us, that we do well to think it the word of God. Yet that which such men as these hold impossible, and a meer Chymiera, or Phansy, which no wise man would hold, you hold to be as evident as the Sun being seen by its own light; as evident as the first Principles, which are so evident of themselves that they need no proof, but are clearer than any thing you can bring to prove them. For example, That the whole is greater than any part. It is impossible that any thing should be so, and not be so, just in the same circumstances, &c. Do you think any rational man will believe that it is thus evident that St. Matthews Gospel (for example) is the true Word of God, by the only reading of it, to him, who did not before read this verity? Do not all evidently see, that there is no such evidence to be seen? About the truth of first Principles no man ever doubted,*

cannot be our Judge in all points. 71

doubted, or could doubt; about St. Matthew's Gospel the Manicheans, Marcionists, Cerdonists, &c. did not only doubt, but flatly rejected it. And incomparable more doubt has been made of other parts of Scripture, as we have seen, and shall yet further see. Sometimes indeed Divines call Scripture *the first Principle, an undoubted Principle, a most known and certain Principle*; Not that it is so for any evidence it carries with it self, manifestly shewing it to be so: But the Scripture is said to be such a Principle among us Christians, because all of us now admit Scripture, as of unquestionable and infallible truth. Upon this *Supposition* (evidently granted by us all) we all, in arguing with one another, still *suppose*, and take for an undoubted Principle, That the Scripture is God's infallible Word. But this do's *only suppose*, and not prove this truth, even so much as to our own Consciences, that Scripture is the undoubted Word of God, which it cannot shew it self infallibly to be, by the only reading of it.

7. Secondly, There be many Millions who can most truly and sincerely protest before God, and take it upon their Salvation, that they are wholly unable, by the meer reading of the Books of Scripture (for example the *Apocalyps*,
the

72 *The Bible not containing all points,*
the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, &c.) to come
to an infallible assurance that they be
Gods Word; to which assurance, even
your admirable *Luther*, and his most
learned Disciples, never came: For
they all reject these, and other Books
admitted for Gods infallible Word by
you. Now good Sir, tell me what
means has God provided to bring us
(who have not these new eyes requisite
to see the Sun-shine you speak of) or to
bring your *Lutheran* Brethren, who will
be confessed not to want the true Spirit
(for they had the first fruits of the Spi-
rit in the blessed work of your Reforma-
tion) what means, I say, has God
provided to bring them and us to this
infallible assurance, by which we are all
obliged, under pain of damnation,
to believe the Scripture to be Gods
Word?

8. Thirdly, How comes it to pass,
that the Preachers of the Church find
that concurrence of Gods Grace, in de-
livering the verities contain'd in the
Scripture to very Heathens, that Mil-
lions of them have been thus converted:
but no single Man is reported (as far
as I know) to have found such con-
currence by only reading the written
Word, as thereby to have been illu-
minated with the belief of Scripture?
How

cannot be our Judge in all points. 73

How comest this about, if the Divinity thereof be to the Reader (when he is as well disposed as the Hearer) no less evident than the broad Sun-shine? Do's not this shew that it is true which we Teach, that these internal Arguments are only discover'd after the Scripture is accepted for Gods Word, and not before, as the Cause of accepting it for such?

6. Fourthly, As the Scripture is the only ground, upon which you build your belief of all other things; so this Divine Light (discover'd to you by reading the Scripture) is the only ground, upon which you believe Scripture; and consequently all other things which you believe. This ground then is the ground of all true Faith, according to your Doctrin. If it be so, how is it possible that the greatest Doctors that ever God placed in the Church to the Edifying the same, upon no one single occasion (having so continual occasions) do so much, as once at least profess themselves to believe such or such a Book to be Gods Word, because they, by the reading of it (which was their daily and nightly work) did discover such divine Rays, or such internal Arguments appearing in it, to those who were versed in it; as *Dr. Fern* speaks? Neither do any one of them

E

give

74 *The Bible not containing all points,*
give so much as once this for a Reason,
why they doubted, or admitted not such
and such Books, about which (before
the definition of the Church) there were
so frequent Controversies, meerly be-
cause they could not discover this Light,
or these internal Arguments. Did these
Men want the Spirit of God, even in the
Foundation of all true Belief? Yea, had
not these Men of all others, the most
observing Eyes; and the most irradiat-
ed understandings, which so many Ages
have brought forth? This Argument
falls heavier upon D. Fern, and those
who like his Doctrin, than upon any
other. For Sect. 7. Having undertaken
to shew *That Sectaries cannot make the Plea*
which Protestants make; he proves this by
this Principle, That Sectaries do not
pretend to confirm what they say by
practice of Antiquity, as Protestants do, ac-
cording to D. Fern, and D. Hen. Ham-
mond. But O great Doctor! I pray, if
you can, shew us but one small scrap
of Antiquity, for this your Fundamental
Doctrin: For surely this most imports
in the very ground-work of Faith. And
(to use your own so often iterated Ar-
gument) your part being the affirma-
tive, affirming a main difference to be
between you and Sectaries (arising from
your adhering close to Antiquity) you
are

cannot be our Judge in all points. 75

are obliged to do this, at least where it so imports, as it do's in the belief of that, upon which you believe all whatsoever you believe. Again, if you be so good at finding out assuredly Gods true Word, from his false Word, meerly by this your sharp eye-sight, you might do notable Service to those who now at *London* set forth the most famous Bible that ever as yet (as they say) did see light. For you could tell them assuredly, which were the true Copies of the true Originals, which not; whereas those short sighted Doctors do openly profess themselves to sweat at this by indefatigable labour, in conferring every Verse with several Copies, and then culling out that which agrees with the most and best Copies. To this industry they Profess themselves to trust, and not to that pretended light, tho' you make it the ground of all your Faith. See the next *Seet. N.8.*

10. Fifthly, I argue thus, Take the Book of *Baruch*, (which you hold not to be Gods Word) in the one hand, and the Book of *Micheas* in the other hand; this Book has seven Chapters: Now I challenge you, if you can, to tell me that Chapter, or the part of that Chapter in any one of these seven Chapters, which has more Divine Rays, or internal Ar-

76 *The Bible not containing all points,*
guments for the Holiness of it, than appear in the six Chapters of the Book of *Barnab.* Your part is affirmative, affirming that there be such internal Arguments, and such Evidences, and that there be more of them in the one than in the other: Shew me but one of them, or else you will shew your selves to the World to vent your own Phantries, for grounds of Belief, even in the most important points of Belief. So I say again, take the Book of *Toby*, take the Book of *Judith*, which you reject for *Apocryphal*, as not carrying with them a Divine Light, and those internal Arguments: Take (I say) either of these Books, and read it over, and be as well vers'd in it as you are in the Book of *Numbers*, for example; and see if it be possible for you, with all the help your Brethren can afford you, to point out any one Chapter, Verse, or Word in the Book of *Numbers*, carrying with it more Divine Rays, or better internal Arguments, than appear in either of the Books I nam'd. What would you have us do with our Eyes, to keep us from seeing how clearly this is impossible unto you? which nevertheless should be most easie, if your Opinion were true, or any thing like to true. For these Divine Rays (say you) carry an Evidence
of

cannot be our Judge in all points. 77

of so high a Degree, that you do not only believe (as we poor Folk do) but you do know these Books to be Divine: And this you know with a most infallible knowledge, produc'd by the Evidence carried in the clear Sun-shine of this Light, and these so conspicuous internal Arguments, making it no less apparent than the first Principles.

II. Sixthly, If any one Verse, or any one small Word, changing the sense of the Holy Ghost (especially this little word, *Not*) be left out in any one Chapter, either through Ignorance, Malice or Carelesness of those Writers (whose Copies our Printed Bibles have followed;) whom will you be able to make believe, that you are so sharp-sighted as to see this small omission, and that by a light sufficing for an infallible belief of it appearing to you only by the reading that place? And yet this you must do to distinguish the true Word of God from the false. But how far all of you are from doing this, I will now declare: All the days of *Queen Elizabeth*, your Bibles did read in the 105 Psalm. v. 28. *They were not obedient*, contrary directly to the true Text; which has, *They were not disobedient*, or *rebelled not against his Words*, as now you read it. These, and Two hundred more Corruptions in the

78 *The Bible not containing all points,*
true Psalms, you did sing daily. And
who was there who did see in what places
these Corruptions were? Yea, the Queen
then Head of the Church, made her
Clergy subscribe that all these Corrupti-
ons were Gods own Word. See the
5 Sect. Num. 4. Whence appears, that you
cannot smell out these Corruptions; of
which I shall say more in the place
cited. They then of your Religion be-
lieve the Scripture upon no ground which
is not fallible, and which may not real-
ly be false, as this Light may be: And
therefore it suffices not to a Divine
Faith: And so you have no infallible be-
lief assuring you, that this Book is Gods
Word; whence all that is in that Book
has no Divine Authority, of which you
are assured. And thus, most pitifully,
all of you are destitute of Divine Faith,
in all points you believe; because you
believe them all upon the Authority of
those Books, which you upon no infal-
lible ground, can believe to be Divine.
See here, how you who boast of Scrip-
ture so much, come, by rejecting the
Church, not to believe the Scripture it
self, with any Divine Faith, but only with
such humane perswasion as may be false;
because it is fallible, having no infallible
ground to stand upon. Hence it is that
your famous *Chillingworth*, having Wit
enough

cannot be our Judge in all points. 79

enough to discover the ungroundedness of this ground, and not having Grace enough to set sure footing upon that firm Rock of the true Church, in plain terms comes to defend (P. 327.) it to be sufficient to believe Scripture with no other kind of assent, than we believe, that there is such a City as *Constantinople*, or the History of *Cæsar* and *Salust*. Whence the ground of his Belief of the Scripture (upon whose Authority only he believes all other things) being thus confessedly found to be Humane, and to have nothing of Divine Faith: he is forced to say (P. 159.) *We have, I believe as great reason to believe, That there was such a Man as Henry the Eighth, King of England, as that Jesus Christ suffered under Pontius Pilate.* Is this a Book to be owned by the prime Doctors of both Universities, and to be so Universally cryed up by our Nation? *Dear Jesu!* to what times were we come? No wonder that these times are now come to us.

12. Seventhly, I further shew the manifest falsity of your Doctrin, by unanswerable experience, confirming what now I said, *Num. 9. Luther* (a man acknowledged by common consent of English Divines, to have had Gods Spirit in a very large measure) did read the Epistle of *S. James*, and he held it to be an

80 *The Bible not containing all points,*
Epistle of Straw, Prefat in *New Test.* and
his chief Disciple *Pomeranus*, upon the
fourth Chapter to the *Romans*, saith,
Out of this place you may discover the error of
the Epistle of James, in which you see a
wicked Argument. Moreover he redoubl-
ly deduceth his Argument: *he cites* (says this
Fellow) *Scripture against Scripture.* But
I go on with *Luther*, he did read the *A-*
pocalyps, and for all the Light and in-
ternal Arguments he could discover in
it, he thought it not written with an
Apostolical Spirit. All our English Di-
vines read these self same Books, and
there is not one of them, nor their Dis-
ciples, so ill sighted, but they can dis-
cover a Light no less, clearly shewing these
Books to be Gods infallible Word; than
the Sun sheweth it self to be the Sun
by its Light; they all see internal Argu-
ments, sufficing to an infallible assent of
the quite contrary verity. But how can
that ground be but false, which groundeth
plain Contradictions? If you reply, that
Luthers not seeing such Books to be Ca-
nonical, is only a negative Argument
of small force. I answer, That where
things are affirmed to be as evident as the
Sun-shine, and as clear as the first Prin-
ciples; and that these things affirmed
by you to be so clear, are also daily
set before the Eyes of a man so well see-
ing

cannot be our Judge in all points. 81

ing as *Luther* and his prime Disciples were; and yet, that neither he, nor his prime Disciples, should ever be able to see this Light (tho' their sharp-sighted Eyes so often laboured to discover it) this cannot be but a certain sign, that either these men were pitifully blind, or that you miserably fancy such a light to shine in the very reading of the *Apocalyps*, the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, the Epistle of *S. James*, &c. Is it a weak Argument to say; I have been in the Hall on set purpose to see if there were a Candle set up lighted there, and I could see none, tho' I most carefully endeavoured to see it, and had my Eyes about me; therefore I conclude there is no Light set up there? I conclude also that either I, who say this am blind; or you, who say there is such a Light, are manifestly deluded by a false fancy of your own. And I can also make my Argument as strong in the affirmative, as in the negative. I I do it thus. *S. Austin* (the most sharp-sighted man that the Church has had) a man confessedly endued with the true Spirit; and a man of your own Religion, as you will say, and consequently a man agreeing with you in that Doctrine, on which all your whole Belief is built; to wit, that true Scriptures

82 *The Bible not containing all points,*

were infallibly believed to be Gods Word; because they were discover'd in the very reading of them to be so, by a Divine Light, and by internal Arguments, sufficing to ground an infallible assent to this verity; this man, I say, and the whole third Council of *Carthage*, together with him, did believe that all and every one of those Books which we believe to be Canonical and Divine, to be so indeed, and to be propounded to be so to the People. Behold here, as good Eyes as you can pretend to have, reading these Books, and believing them infallibly to be Divine; which they could not do (according to your Doctrine) but by discovering in them a Divine Light, shewing this Truth evidently, and by such internal Arguments, as suffice to infallibility. Therefore these Books (seen so infallibly to be Divine) are indeed so, and you must grant them to be so, and not to be Apocryphal, as you hold them; or else you must grant that S. *Austin* and the Fathers of the Council of *Carthage*, and all the Fathers, who ever after this Council held this our Canon, did not agree with you in the prime Principle of your Religion, teaching that there is no infallible ground to believe such and such Books to be Gods Word, but that di-
vine

cannot be our Judge in all points. 83

vine Light appearing in the reading of them to such Readers as they were. For if they agreed with you in this Principle, then they did conceive themselves to discover this divine Light in those very Books which you call *Apecryphal*, as well as in the other, which you hold Canonical. And if they all were deceived by this Principle in those Books, then you may be deceived in all the other, because your only ground for their being Divine, is hence clearly proved to be fallible and false, and most insufficient to ground an infallible Belief: But you have no other Faith than that which rests wholly on this ground: Therefore all the Faith you have is fallible. And if any one object that S. *Jerom* (as great a Doctor in point of the knowledge of the Scriptures as S. *Austin*) did not hold the Book of the *Machabees* for Gods Word; which S. *Austin* held to be Gods Word: Therefore one of them relied on a fallible ground; why not S. *Austin*, as well as S. *Jerom*? I Answer, That even from hence, it is evident that neither of these two (tho' the most Eagle-sighted Doctors that ever the Church had) did make the ground of their receiying or rejecting Books for true or false Scripture, to be any such Divine Light, appearing to such Readers as both they were:

For

84 *The Bible not containing all points,*

For then they could not have held quite
contrary one to another, as I find of
the *Lutherans* and you. The true Reason,
why these two great Doctors were of
contrary Opinions concerning these
Books, as also divers other holy Fa-
thers were concerning divers other
Books (which had been impossible if
the evidence of true Scripture had
been so great as you make it) the
true reason, I say, was, that as yet
the Church of Christ had not defined
which Books were Gods true Word,
which not: Wherefore, then it was
free to doubt of such Books as were
not admitted by such a Tradition of
the Church, as was evidently so Uni-
versal, that it was clearly sufficient to
ground an infallible Belief. For all those
holy Fathers agreed ever in this, that
such Books were evidently Gods Word,
which had evidently a sufficient Tra-
dition for them: Now in the days of
those Fathers, who thus varied from
one another, it was not by any infal-
lible means made known to all, that
those Books (about which all their va-
riance was) were recommended for Gods
infallible Word, by a Tradition clear-
ly sufficient to ground Belief, for the
Church had not as yet examined and de-
fin'd, whether Tradition did clearly
enough

enough shew such and such Books to be Gods infallible Word. But in the days of *St. Austin*, the third Council of *Carthage*, Anno 397, examin'd how sufficient or unsufficient the Tradition of the Church was, which recommended those Books for Scripture, about which there was so much doubt and contrariety of Opinions. They found all the Books contain'd in our Canon (of which you account so many *Apocryphal*) to have been recommended by a Tradition, sufficient to ground Faith upon. For on this ground (*Can. 47.*) they proceeded in defining all the Books in our Canon to be Canonical. *Because*, say they, *we have receiv'd from our Fathers, that these Books were to be read in the Church.* Pope *Innocent the First*, (who lived Anno 402.) being requested by *Exuperius*, Bishop of *Tolouse*, to declare unto him which Books were Canonical, he answers Ep. 3. that having examin'd what sufficient Tradition did demonstrate, *Quid custodita series temporum demonstraret*, in the end of his Epistle c. 7. he sets down, *Quid libri recipiantur in Canone Sanctarum Scripturarum*, *What Books are receiv'd in the Canon of the Holy Scriptures.* To wit, just those which we now have in our Canon. And tho' he rejects many other Books, yet he rejects not one of these. So that after these

86 *The Bible not containing all points,*

Declarations of the sufficiency of this Tradition; no one ever pertinaciously dissented from it, but such, as Protestants themselves do confess to be Heretics; until the days of *Luther*, who presumed to call *Apocryphal*, not only those Books which you count to be so, but also divers others, as I shewed here *Num. 1.* Hence from the time of the Council of *Carthage*, and *Innocent* the First, all in their daily citations of Scripture, until the days of *Luther*, held those very Books to be Gods Word, which we hold to be, and were defined by them to be held to be so, upon Tradition duly examin'd. And this within Four hundred years after Christ, yet after the time of *S. Jerom.* Now after this was done, there comes *S. Austin*, and sets down all these Books for Canonical, *Lib. de Doctrina Christiana, C. 8.* After him, comes *Gelasius* the Pope (who lived *Anno 492.*) and confirms the same Canon. After him, comes the Sixth General Council, celebrated *Anno, 680.* which in the second Canon (according to the Greek Copy, translated by *Gentianus*) desiring to Establish *what their Holy forefathers had deliver'd unto them*, confirms this, and the other Council of *Carthage*. Go further downwards, and still all Doctors and Writers, in their daily allegations of Scripture, cite these Books as Scripture.

cannot be our Judge in all points. 87

Scripture. The true Canon again is set forth by the Council of *Florence*, Anno, 1438. To which Council, the very *Grecians*, *Armenians*, and *Jacobites* subscribed: No man pertinaciously gainsaying this so well Establish'd Tradition, until *Luther*. Now if the true discovery of Scripture be to go by the Votes of the best and the most Eyes; who sees not, but that even by this Rule, we shall have above half a score Books discover'd to be Gods Word, which your own sharp Eyes cannot see to be so? especially that second Book of *Machabees*, in which we so clearly discover Purgatory, c. 12. v. 43, 44, 45. If any man objects, that in the Council of *Cartbage*, &c. That one Book of the Prophet *Baruch*, is not set down by name (tho' never excluded) he must remember that this Book of *Baruch*, is joyned in our Bible with *Jeremy*, whose Secretary he was, and as his Secretary, he joyned his Book as an Appendix to *Jeremy*: And therefore it is understood by these Fathers to be admitted together with all *Jeremy*, excluding no part of him, as you exclude. I end then this Sixth Reason thus, The best seeing Eyes of Antiquity, have seen different Books to be Gods Word, from those which you hold to be so: Again, your own first Brethren in your Reformation

88 *The Bible not containing all points,*
mation have seen those Books not to be Canonical, which you have seen to be so: Therefore the true Scripture is not infallibly to be known by so evident a Light as you speak of, by which Contradictories can never be seen.

13. If any man think he can escape the force of any of these Arguments, by pretending the private assurance of the Spirit, making this dim Light appear clearly to him, which so many others (for want of the assistance of the Spirit) come not to see; This man will run upon two main inconveniences. The First is, that he most ungroundedly lays claim for himself, and for all the little Flock of his Brethren, to have in private this assistance of the Spirit assisting them, even as far as infallibility, to the hardest of all points: And yet, most ungroundedly denies any such assistance to the Universal Church, represented in a General Council. He denies also the same Spirit unto the greatest Doctors of the Church, confessed by all to have been the chief Lights of the World, for Sanctity and knowledge in Scriptures: For all these are found standing directly opposite to them in their Canon of Scripture, and not one of them can be shewed to agree with them in this prime ground of admitting any Book for Gods Word, upon
the

cannot be our Judge in all points. 89

the Light which God gave him by the Spirit. The second inconvenience is, that when he is questioned to give an account, how he is assured, that he in particular has this assistance of the Spirit, sufficing to ground an infallible assent; and how he is most assured, that this is not an illusion? He can only answer, that he has tried, as well as he (poor Soul) could, whether this Spirit were from God or no; and he found it (and that infallibly) to be from God. But Sir, I ask you by what infallible means did you try it? If you say (as you must needs say) that you tried it by the Word of God: We cannot but pity your pitiful Answer; for you forget that before this Trial was made, you could not have any assurance that the Scripture was Gods Word; to the belief of which truth, you cannot possibly come, until you have first an infallible assurance, that you in particular have Gods Spirit. For tell me, by what other way you can come to this assurance? How can you then say, that you have tried your Spirit by that Word, which before this trial of your Spirit, you could not possibly know to be infallibly Gods Word. You will all walk in a Circle, as the wicked do, and as that wicked Spirit, who circles about to see whom he

90 *The Bible not containing all points,*
he can devour; until you come to
stand stedfastly upon the Rock of the
Church.

Seet. 4.

*An Eighth Argument. That the Scripture can-
not decide this Controversie, which Books
be the true uncorrupted Copies of the true
Books of Scripture. And therefore Prote-
stants believe not Scripture with Divine
Faith.*

*A Word of the famous Bible now coming
forth at London.*

r. **A**S it is in vain to know for certain,
that my Father did (to my great
advantage) make a true authentical Will
and Testament, of which I conceive my
self to have a true Copy; without I can
authentically prove the Copy that I have
to be indeed authentical. So it is to small
purpose, that God did by his Prophets,
write such Books as *Genesis, Exodus*, and
the rest of the Old and New Testament,
to our inestimable advantage; unless I
can also by undeniable assurance shew
my self to have the true authentical and
uncorrupted Copies of all these Books;
uncorrupted, I say, in all parts of them;
for if it were not known to be uncorrupted
every

cannot be our Judge in all points. 91

every where, it might be suspected of falsity every where. Now that the Copies, which we have of Scripture, even in the *Hebrew* or *Greek* Tongues, be uncorrupted, we are no where told plainly in Scripture. The last part of the Scripture which was written, was written about a Thousand and Six hundred years ago. No Scripture has been written since that time, to tell us, that since that time no Corruption has happen'd, or falsifying the Copies written since that time: No Scripture then written did plainly assure us, that the Scriptures should never be corrupted by those who printed or writ them. Neither did the Apostles take care to have the Copies, written by them, to be authentically signed, sealed, and deliver'd into the hands of such and such, as might authentically declare their being true Originals, or agreeing in all things exactly with the true Originals; which is an evident sign, that God intended not the Scriptures for our Judge, and only Direction in all points: For all Law-makers use this diligence, to secure their Laws from corruption. Behold then, here is now a Sixteenth point, primely necessary to Salvation, and yet no where set down in Scripture: I say, primely necessary; For if it be necessary to have Faith, it is necessary to

92 *The Bible not containing all points,*

to have the only Rule directing and guiding to true Faith, no where made crooked and directed false, as a false corrupted Copy would do. Here then, you must fly to the Tradition of the Church; yea, and to the Tradition of the present Church also: for the Church of other Ages, could not assure us that the Scripture should be uncorrupted in our Age. Is it not as great a contradiction as can be, to say, we know by the Tradition of the present Church, that, that very Scripture is uncorrupted, which very Scripture bids us not to believe the Tradition of the Church: Which if I do not believe, I cannot believe the Scripture to be uncorrupted, and that infallibly, if her Tradition (upon which only I believe this) be fallible? The Traditions then of the present Church be as infallibly true as your Faith; which I prove by this Demonstration: Your Faith cannot be more infallibly true than it is true that the Copies of the Scripture be uncorrupted; for your Faith is built upon the Word of God, as deliver'd to you by these Copies: Just as we say, our Faith is built upon the Word of God, as propounded or deliver'd to us by the Church: But it is not infallibly true, that the Copies we have now be uncorrupted, because that very Tradition of the present Church, which

which tells us this, is held by you to be fallible and subject to lye; and which in a multitude of her other Traditions, has lyed unto us, according to your Doctrin. Here you see again, that you believe nothing at all with Divine Faith; For all you believe, you believe upon the Word of God, as deliver'd to you by such Copies as you only, by an Humane Faith, know to be the true deliverers of Gods uncorrupted Word: This ground is fallible, being meerly Humane; Therefore the ground which supports all you believe, is Humane and not Divine: Therefore all your Faith is Humane, and not Divine; and this holds true in all and every point which you believe.

2. I will now further shew you, how you cannot know by Scripture only, that the Copies of it be uncorrupt, in those very Languages in which the Scripture was written: And yet this point is primely necessary to Salvation, as I now proved: And indeed if the Originals cannot be known assuredly to be uncorruptedly Copied out, all the Translations of these Originals may also be false: Now the more they agree with corrupted Originals, the more we are sure they are corrupted. But of Translations I will speak in the next Section: Here I will speak of the Copies, which
are

94 *The Bible not containing all points,*

are said to be Copied out of the true Original Copies, agreeing word for word with those very Copies, which *St. Paul, St. Matthew, Moses, &c.* did write: These Copies we know by no Scripture to be uncorrupt. Yea, if you will hold the Church to be Fallible; I will bring you several convincing proofs, that there can be no certainty, that these Copies agree with the true Copies written by the true Scripture-writers. These Scripture-writers did write, either in such Hebrew as was us'd in the Age in which they did write, (as did the Writers of the *Old Testament*;) or they did write in Greek; as did most of the Writers of the *New Testament*. Let us see first, how disagreeing the Hebrew Copies may be from the Original Copy of the true Writer thereof: Then we will see the same of the Greek Copies.

3. First, Divers of the very Originals themselves were written by such Men as we know not at all, and so we cannot know them certainly to have been true Prophets, but by Tradition; which, if it may be false, it may also be false, that they were true Prophets, having Gods true Spirit, assuring them infallibly in all that they did write: And so, tho' we did infallibly know, that we had a most uncorrupted Copy of what they did write, yet we should not be able to know that it were

cannot be our Judge in all points. 95

were Gods Infallible Word: For, how could we know, that he, who writ this Book, was a true Prophet; no body (as far as any body knows) telling us one word of that Man, good or bad? For these Books were written by God knows whom. We have nothing but uncertain Opinions concerning the Writers of diverse of the most assur'd and protocanonical Books of Scripture; as of the Books of *Joshua, Ruth, Judges, Ester*, the Books of *Kings*, the Books of *Chronicles*, or *Paralipomenon*. So also, it is not certain, whether *Solomon* himself did write his Books of *Proverbs*; or some that were about him did severally in scatter'd Papers; one note what he heard at one time; another, what he heard him say at another time: And then, in the days of *Ezechias*, some certain Men (God knows who they were) belonging to *Ezechias*, did make that Collection of them which we now have; as the most Learn'd *Lyranus* holds, writing on that Book, and grounding himself on these words, *Cap. 25. These are also Proverbs of Solomon which the Men of Ezechias Copied out.* Wherefore not upon the Authority of any Scripture; but meerly upon the Authority of Tradition, we know those true Original Copies to have been Penn'd by true Prophets; tho' we know not who they were.

4. But,

56 *The Bible not containing all points,*

4. But, that which I press most, is, that, tho' we had all the Infallible Knowledge that could be, that such Prophets and *Moses* had writ with their own Hands, such and such Books: Yet it is impossible (if the present Churches Authority be Fallible) to know infallibly, whether the Copies we have now in our Days, agree in all places exactly with the Original. Yea, we are sure they do not agree with it; which I prove thus: No Books of Scripture were so solemnly, publicly, and most authentically delivered to be kept, just as they were written, as the Books of *Moses*, witness the Scripture, *Exodus* 24. v. 4 and *Deut.* 31. v. 24. And it came to pass, when *Moses* had made an end of writing the words of the Law in a Book, until they were finished; that *Moses* commanded the Levites, which bare the Ark of the Covenant of our Lord, saying, take this Book of the Law, and put it in the side of the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, that it may be there for a witness; &c. But these very Books, thus written, until they were finished, have manifestly receiv'd the Addition of the last Chapter of *Deuteronomy*, which was written after the death of *Moses*; as *Calvin* himself confesseth. So *Gen.* 26. v. 31. is clearly added by some body, who liv'd in the times in which the Children of *Israel* had Kings, which was long after

cannot be our Judge in all points. 97

after the days of *Moses*: How then could he say, *And these are the Kings which reigned in the Land of Edom, before there reigned any King over the Children of Israel?* Who could set down these Kings, as having reign'd until the days of the Kings of *Israel*, but some body who liv'd after their Reign? *Bonsfrevius*, in his Preface to the *Pentateuch*, adds two other places, chang'd since *Moses* writ them. That the like changes have happen'd to the Book of *Joshua*, to the fourth of *Kings*, and to *Jeremy*, is witnessed by *Torniellus*, *Anno Mundi* 3612. But let no Man think, that I recount these changes as corruptions; for we all believe those Additions to have been made to the true Copies of *Moses*, and those other Writers by Men specially inspir'd by God to make them: Yet we, standing only to the Human Authority of History, cannot tell by whom those changes were made; no History telling us, that the Authors of these changes were Prophets, or Imposters. Only we have the Tradition of the present Church, assuring us infallibly (which she should not, if she were Fallible) that the Scriptures, we now at present have, are infallibly Gods Word; and consequently, what changes soever have been made in them, were made by sufficient Authority from God. You, who reject this Authority

F

rity

98 *The Bible not containing all points,*
rity of the Church, can have no assurance that many other changes were not made, as well as these: And such changes as may be most foul corruption, for any thing you know. Again,

5. If we speak of such changes as may be both corruptions, and most pernicious corruptions, in the Hebrew Bible; You (who reject the Testimony of the Church as a fallible witness,) cannot possibly make it appear, that the Hebrew Copies be not grossly corrupted since the times of the Apostles: For many and great changes might, after their times, be made by the Jewish Rabbins (men most perfidious and malicious,) when they did add Points to the Text under pretence of preventing such mistakes, as might easily happen to the less skilful in reading the Hebrew Text; which to that day had no Points to express the Vowels: For in the Original it was written only with Consonants, and the Vowels were left to be added by the well instructed Reader; for whose help (in reading the Scriptures right,) the Jewish Rabbins did first begin to add certain Points, so to tell us where an A, or an E, or any other Vowel was to be added according to the true manner of reading that place. Now only God knows whether these, so malicious
and

cannot be our Judge in all points. 99

and perfidious Jews, taught us to read every Vowel as it should be read in such a place; and did not, by the adding of what Vowels they pleased, change the sense of the Word, to signify what they pleas'd. The putting of the Vowels right or wrong depended, not only upon the assuredness of their skill, which (for any thing we know) might in some places be deficient, and we not knowing these places, are sure of no places; But also the putting of these Vowels depended primely on their sincere, and upright honest dealing; which we cannot, in true prudence, much expect from such sworn Enemies to Christianity, as those Jews were. Such men then as these putting all and every one of the Vowels to every Word of the Hebrew Text, a good while after the Apostles time; what human evidence have we, sufficing to a certain assurance, of the adding the right Vowel to every Syllable of the whole Hebrew Bible? If wrong Vowels be added, the Sense will be incredibly wronged: The Vowel is the very Soul of the Syllable, either making, or marring the true sound and signification, and altering it to most different Senses; Inasmuch that, not only in every Word, but even in every Syllable, alteration may be made of the true Sense. So in the *La-*

100 *The Bible not containing all points,*
in Word *Monere* to admonish, if you
change the Vowels at your pleasure (as
those *Jewish* Rabbins might often do, for
any thing we know) you may read *Mo-*
neri, to be admonished; *Manere*, to stay;
Manare, to flow from; *Minari*, to threa-
ten; *Munire*, to fence; *Muniri*, to be
well fenced; *Munera*, gifts; *Minora*, less
things: And thus the Vowels change and
alter the right Word in several parts.
The Hebrew Language is most subject to
this inconvenience of any other, because
it consists exceeding much of words of
one Syllable; in which the change of the
Vowel makes the Sense a perfect chang-
eling. So in English, suppose the Scrip-
ture should speak against the abuses in
Balls: There comes a *Protestant*, and he
will say, it is against the abuses of *Popish*
Bulls; There comes a Puritan, and he
will say it is against the abuse of *Bells*,
using them in such manners as have
no Authority in Scripture; some upstart
Sectary will say it is against *Bills*, and o-
ther Arms, which Christian mildness
do's not allow of. See here how the
change of one Vowel in one Syllable on-
ly, quite alters the Sense. This change
of one Vowel, makes a fat *Man*, to be
a fit *Man*: And *fatness* in all places, to
be *fitness* in all places: It makes that
which is *Better*, to be *Bitter*: It makes
a *Pot*

cannot be our Judge in all points. for
a Pot full of Butter, to be a Pit full of Bas-
ter. Though you magnifie so much the
present Hebrew Copy, as we have it now
pricked and pointed, to point us out the
true Vowels; yet your own English Bi-
bles, in several places, testify their cor-
ruption, by forsaking their Translation to
follow ours: I will give you but one
example; We, (and you with us) read,
They have pierced my Hands and my Feet,
Psal. 22. v. 16. So clear a Prophecie for
our Saviours Crucifixion, is quite turned
to another Sense in the present Hebrew
Copies, where these malicious Jews
make us read, *As a Lyon my Hands
and Feet.* Thus you see how very little
is the assurance, which those, who
know Hebrew, have, even of their very
reading it right as it should be, accord-
ing to the true meaning of the Scrip-
ture-Writer: Of *David* for example, of
whole true meaning, these false Pointers
have disappointed us: We then now
have no assurance; to know what Vowels
should have been put. And if any man
now in these days, do's pretend to be sure
that he has so much skill, as to tell, by
the Consonants only, what Vowels should
for certain be put, according to the mean-
ing of *Moses*, of *David*, or of any other
Writer; I would only desire this cun-
ning man, to give me a tryal of his

102 *The Bible not containing all points,*
skill, by telling me what Vowel I mean
to have put to these three Consonants;
Bll; Whether I mean to signify a *Bell*, a
Bell, a *Bill*, or a *Bull*. You will sooner
tell me whether the Pins I hold now in
my left hand be even or odd. Here
you will be sure to hit right at twice;
for surely they be one of the two:
But you may guess twice two times,
before you assuredly Prophesie, whe-
ther I mean by those three Consonants to
signifie a *Bell*, a *Bell*, a *Bill*, or a *Bull*.

6. Now for the Greek Copies; Tho'
the Copy of the Septuagint be not O-
riginal, yet questionless, if we were sure
that we had the true Original of that
Translation, it would be a strong
ground, for as much as concerns those
Books which those 70 Interpreters
Translated, who lived 300 years before
the New Testament was written: But
you your selves exceeding often refuse,
in your English Bibles, to follow the
present Copies of the Septuagint; as
Copies that are by you esteemed corrupt-
ed in several places; and consequently
secure in no place. I shew this in several
points of great Consequence. So *Psal.*
118. v. 12. *I have inclined my heart to*
perform thy justifications for a reward: St. Au-
gustin upon this place, says; For which
reward, he says he did incline his heart

cannot be our Judge in all points. 103
to perform the Justifications of God: Hence
proving, as you see, that David did make
profession to do good works, and to keep
God's Commandments for the reward
he hoped to get thereby. So the Scrip-
ture says of Moses, *that he had respect to the
recompence of the reward*; and out of this
respect did that most Noble act of pre-
ferring the ignominy of Christ, before the being
great in the Egyptian Court: Heb. 11. v.
26. You to avoid this argument drawn
from the clear Text of the Septuagint,
flie from their Translation, to the He-
brew Copy of a doubtful Sense, the one
agreeing with the Septuagint, the other
agreeing to your turn of shifting off our
and St. *Austins* Sense; by reading as you
read, *I have inclined my heart to perform thy
statutes alway even unto the end*. So in the
fourth Chapter of Daniel, v. 27. Daniel
says to Nebuchadnezer, *Redeem thy sins
with Alms*: Which words are most lite-
rally Translated out of the Copies of the
Septuagint: But because they make so
manifestly for Popish satisfaction, by
which they hope to redeem their sins,
(Christ's Passion dignifying their good
works,) you refuse again to stand to the
Septuagint, and flie again to the present
Hebrew Copy, which having both the
Sense of the Septuagint, and another Sense
helping you to shift off this place, you fol-

104 *The Bible not containing all points,*
low that Sense and read, *Break off your sins*
by righteousness. Hence it appears, that
you your selves will not allow the true
Sense of the Original Greek Copies of
the Septuagint. And indeed St. *Jerom*
find's frequent fault with the Copies he
had in his days of their Translation;
(which Translation he reverenceth :) See
him in *Quæst. Hebr. de optimo genere inter-*
pretandi, Epist. ad Suniam & Fritillam : And
he often complains of the corruption of
his Greek Copies in his Commentaries
upon the Prophets. Now in our days *Bel-*
larmino Lib. 2. de verbo Dei, c. 6. hold's
that the Copies of this most famous Tran-
slation are so corrupted, that they seem
to make a new, and quite different Tran-
slation; as he proves by many Arguments,
of which one is this: *Genesis 26.* Where
the servants of *Isaac* do say, according to
the Septuagint, *We have not found Water :*
Whereas they should say, *We have found*
Water ; as is prov'd by the Hebrew, and
by *Isaac* his own Words, calling the
Name of that place *Abundance,* for the
plenty of Water found therein.

7. I come now to the New Testament,
which almost all of it (except St. *Matthews*
Gospel) was by the Apostles themselves
written in Greek. The chief points of
our Faith depend upon the New Testa-
ment. If the Copies in this Language
agree

cannot be our Judge in all points. 105
agree not exactly, and in all places, (for
falsity in one place proves possibility of
falsity in other places) with the first Co-
pies written by the Apostles; our Judge
(for whose sole Authority you plead) will
be convinc'd of Corruption; and there-
fore no Infallible Judge. Your great Do-
ctor *Beza* upon *Acts* 7. 16. do's muster
up a whole Catalogue of Corruptions in
the Greek Copies. The same *Beza* judg-
eth *Erasmus* the best of all latter Transla-
tors: And yet, *Erasmus*, speaking of the
Sixth of *St. Matt.* condemns the Greek of
trifling and rash Additions. If you will be
judg'd by the Greek Copies; then you
must confess, that Christ in the Sacra-
ment did give us his true Blood; for all
the Greek Copies of *St. Luke*, *Cap. 22.*
v. 20. read thus, *This Cup is the New Te-*
stament in my Blood, which (Cup) is shed for
you. So that the Cup, that is, the thing
contain'd in the Cup, was that very thing
which was shed for us; but not Wine, but
Christ's true Blood was shed for us: There-
fore not Wine, but Christ's true Blood
was the thing contain'd in the Cup. It is a
memorable thing which is lately related
by *Mr. Cressy Exomol. Ca. 8. Nu. 3.* in these
words, "In my hearing, Bishop *Usher*
" profess'd, that whereas he had of ma-
" ny Years before a desire to publish the
" *New Testament* in Greek, with various

106 *The Bible not containing all points,*

“ Lessons and Annotations; and for that
“ purpose had us’d great diligence, and
“ spent much Mony to furnish himself
“ with Manuscripts: Yet in Conclusion
“ he was forc’d to desist utterly, lest, if
“ he should ingenuously have noted all
“ the several differences of reading which
“ himself had collected, the incredible
“ multitude of them almost in every
“ Verse, should rather have made Men
“ Atheistical, than satisfie them in the
“ true reading of any particular pas-
“ sage; an evident sign that Governors of
“ the Church did not rely only upon
“ what was in Writing. So he. And tho’
he has now twice Printed this, and tho’
others have also divulg’d the same in
Print; yet B. *Usher* seeing this done
before his Eyes, do’s not disclaim from it;
therefore I cannot but believe the Story
to be true: And if it be true, how won-
derfully corrupted is your only Judge?
Now if B. *Usher* alone, in this remote cor-
ner of the World, being a private Man,
could procure so many old Copies in
Writing; what might have been done by
• some great Prince, using all industry to
get (by means of other great Princes, and
• all other diligences,) all the old Copies
they could? For as the multitude of Co-
pies, procur’d by Bishop *Usher*, did in-
crease the variety of different Readings;

cannot be our Judge in all points. 107

so a far greater multitude of Copies, would in all probability, have yet much more increas'd this variety and difference. And the same variety, for the same cause, might yet have been found to be far greater, if five or six great Princes living in five or six Kingdoms (at the greatest distance from one another,) should have all conspir'd to gather together all the ancientest Copies that were any where to be had. Wherefore, if in those only Copies, procur'd by Bishop *Usher*, the multitude of several readings were incredible almost in every Verse: How much more incredible would the multitude of several readings be, if the diligence, I spoke of, should be us'd to procure a greater multitude of written Copies? I ask now, when, in these latter days Printing was invented, how those, who caus'd the Greek Translation (which we have) to be Printed; how (I say) could they know for certain, that, that one reading (which they thought good to follow in their Printed Copies) was the true reading? Or how could any Man tell which written Copy of *B. Usher's* was the true written Copy? I pray let us so much as know our Judge, before we be oblig'd to accept of him in all matters. Yea, you make us know he is corrupted in many matters; and others may make us know that

108 *The Bible not containing all points,*
that he is corrupted in many more. And
sure I am, that corrupted Judges, are not
competent Judges. Crooked Rules are
not good directors. The Rule that is gi-
ven to us all by God, to direct us all, must
be a Rule easily appliable by all: For
this Reason, you say, all must read the
Scriptures, and your meaning is (and
must be) that they must read the true
Scripture; that is, some true Copy of the
true Books of Scripture: By what means
shall they be assur'd, that they read the
true Copy, there being such an incredi-
ble difference between Copies which are
set forth for true? Not one among an
hundred thousand can have this assu-
rance; either for want of means to get the
reading of these Manuscripts, or for want
of skill to read them, and understand
them, so as to be able to inform him-
self of their perfect agreeing in Points
necessary; especially, seeing that you
so little agree in teaching us, which
Points be necessary and fundamental,
that you could never yet be able to
give us the number of them; much
less, to tell us, which they were, or in
what Books, or Chapters of the Bible
they were to be found. Wherefore he,
who will upon his own Knowledge,
and not upon some other Mans Cre-
dit, (far inferior to a General Council,)
inform

cannot be our Judge in all points. 109

inform himself of the truth of his Copy (sufficiently to have a full assurance that it is the true undoubted Copy of the true undoubted Word of God;) he (I say) who will so much as hope to do this, is not one among an hundred thousand. How then can this be that Rule given by God, to be apply'd by every Man, to judge by it for himself; by which one among one hundred thousand cannot be able to judge for himself, whether this undoubtedly be that Rule given him by God. Excellently *Seneca, Omnia delibera cum amico, sed prius delibera de amico. All consultations with thy sure friend make; but first consult Whom for this friend to take.* Before thou consultest the whole business of thine Eternity with this Copy, first consult how sure thou art of the sureness of this thy Copy. If every Man (as Protestants will have it) be to be Judge for himself in Points which so nearly concern himself, then doubtless, in the very first place, he is to judge for himself of this Point above all Points which concerns him as much as that upon which all other Points of highest concernment do wholly depend.

Thus you see, how, not one Man among one hundred thousand escapes being gull'd by you, whilst you all make
him

110 *The Bible not containing all points,*
him believe, that if he will follow you,
he shall see with his own Eyes, what he
do's, and he shall judge for himself; and
not take his Religion upon trust, as
you make them believe we do, because
we trust General Councils. O dearest
Brethren in *Christ*! for his, and for your
own sakes, set your Eyes at least half o-
pen, and you shall presently see, whe-
ther we, or you be those who take up
our Faith on trust. Do we do this, be-
cause we believe and trust General Coun-
cils? These Councils, even in Human
Knowledge and Sincerity of Judgment,
far excel any private Man, trusted by you
in this capital Point: And, besides Hu-
man Knowledge, they have the Infallible
Assistance of the Holy Ghost promis'd to
them; at least as much, if not more than
to those Men, whom you trust. Or
rather, do not you take your Faith on
trust; for who of you is able to judge for
himself, which is the true undoubted Co-
py of the true Word of God, by which
only you must rule your Faith in all
Points? And who therefore is there a-
mong you, who seeing himself wholly
unable to judge for himself in this
Point, (on which all others wholly
depend) is not forc'd to rely upon in-
comparable weaker Authority, than
is the Authority of a General Council,

cannot be our Judge in all points. 111

to which the prime Prelates of this World are call'd, bringing with them the ablest Divines they can get, each one in the Province, from which he comes: And all of the Council delivering not so much their Opinion (equal at least to yours) but delivering what has been by them receiv'd universally from their Ancestors, without note of novelty. Whereas you, when all comes to all, must in this very Point of Points, rely wholly on the Authority of those few Learn'd Men, who have thought good to set forth this Copy, which you take upon their word, to agree faithfully in all places with the true undoubted Original. And this also must be done by you Mr. *Minister*, and by you Mr. *Doctor*, without you be perhaps a Man more learn'd, than that one, who cannot be pick'd out among an hundred thousand. Now if this be the case of Men, tho' so very Learn'd; what more clear, than that the less Learn'd (which make up the multitude of Souls redeem'd by *Christ*) cannot possibly judge for themselves in this Point of Points; but must trust others to judge for them, and rely wholly upon their Judgment? What think you now? Is this as safe as relying on the Church Universal, represented in a General Council? Now if this Council

112 *The Bible not containing all points,*

cil may be more prudently rely'd upon in this Point of high concernment; Why may it not be rely'd upon, and judg'd for us in Points of less concernment? Shall I wisely trust a Man with a thousand pounds, and be unwise, if I trust him with an hundred pounds? Shall it be most prudently done, to let General Councils judge for me, which Books I am to hold for the Copies of Gods Word, and shall it be imprudence to let a General Council judge for me, whether I am to pray to Saints, or no? to pray for the Dead, or no? to hold *Christ* most really present in the Sacramen, or no? What Scripture, or any thing like Scripture, have you, to tell me, that the Church, represented in a Council, shall not deceive me in this Point (most important of all Points :) but that it may deceive me in other things, in which it is more easie to judge right? The Church is a Judge, (as I shall shew hereafter) to which the Multitude of People may have free access; and hear plainly, clearly, and most undoubtedly, what is deliver'd for true, by the Sentence of this most grave Judge: And such a Judge it beseem'd the Divine Providence to give the People, if he seriously desir'd to bring them, by belief of the only true Faith, to Salvation,

Salvation. Whereas it is not possible, for one among one hundred thousand, to hear plainly, clearly, and most undoubtedly, the Sentence deliver'd by any Book of Scripture, concerning the true Copy of the true Scripture; tho' all my Faith must depend upon this, as you say: Neither can you find any other way to make me secure of this choice of a true Copy, comparable to the Authority of a General Council.

8. To shew this more plainly, I will most faithfully relate unto you, that which you may soon see with your own Eyes, if you please. Your prime Masters of Antiquity, your chief Doctors in all those Languages, in which Scripture anciently was written, have begun to set forth the most compleat Bible that ever yet appear'd (as they say) for the number of the Ancient Languages in which it is setting forth, and for the exquisite exactness of the Copies, of which I spake, *Seet. 3. N. 9.* The first five Books are already Printed, and to be seen in many persons hands. The same Men have also (in order to their Bible) set forth an Introduction, Printed at *London* by *Tho. Roycroft*, Anno 1655. In the Preface to this Introduction, they profess, they cannot produce any one Copy, which they can assure us to agree in all things with.

114 *The Bible not containing all points,*
with the true Original Hand-writing of
the Authors; Wherefore (say they) in
the variety of Copies, what better Means
can so much as be invented, to pick out the
true reading, than the conferring of the
most choice and most ancient Copies; and then
to stand to that reading, which agrees best
with the greater part of the most ancient, and
most choice Copies? This course St. Jerom,
&c. This St. Austin took, &c. So they.
The chief thing they pretend to excel
others in, is, *Exemplarium optimorum de-
lectu*, In the choiceness of the very best Copies.
Well now (dear Reader) can Human In-
dustry, such as this is (that is, as great as
is to be expected in this World by thee)
take more pains, or do more, to pro-
cure for thee the truest Copies, which can
be had for Love or Money? And, stand-
ing in Human Industry, Millions of
Millions have wanted this means of
discovering the true Copy, which these
Learn'd Men have. But what do's all
this avail another Man? For your
Religion will have every one in point
of Faith to Judge for himself: So Dr.
Fern, S. 8. thinks, that because the
Roman Church will have us to trust to
her Judgment, pronounc'd by and with
the consent of a General Council;
she will have us to thrust out our
Right-eye, the Eye of our Spiritual
Understand-

cannot be our Judge in all points. 115

“Understanding, &c. Wherefore, says
“he, we cannot yield, but must say,
“that no man can believe any thing truly,
“unless he be convinc’d of it in his
“judgment according to that, *Rom. 14.*
“*v. 5. Let every one be fully perswaded in*
“*his own mind*; Concluding, by the due
“use (note these words) of his Reason,
“that it is God’s Holy Will that they
“should so do and believe. And by
“and by he tells you, why he said, that
he must conclude (all that he is to believe)
“*by the due use of his reason. For notwithstanding*
“*standing the Publick Judgment of the*
“*Church in a full Council,* (add notwithstanding also the private Judgment of
such great Doctors as these are, who
now so painfully labour in procuring the
true Copy of the Bible for us) Private
“Christians (says Dr. Fern) have their
“private Judgments of discretion for
“themselves only, which is the discern-
“ing, and receiving to themselves only,
“as the Will of God, what is deliver’d
“and propounded to them. For they
“must answer also for themselves, and
“live by their own Faith; which can-
“not be without allowing them due use
“of their Reason and Judgment, to see
“the evidence of that to which they
“much assent. This is that which Dr.
Fern, and other Protestant Doctors are
pleased

116 *The Bible not containing all points,*
plased to call, *The due use of reason.* Be-
hold here (you most learned Doctors,
who so unweariedly sweat in setting forth
this your admirable Bible) behold a
Doctrin taught every where by your
own Divines, and most necessary to
maintain your standing out to submit
your inward judgment to the definiti-
ons of Councils: A Doctrin, making
all your labour of very little or no use
at all, to your Protestant Brethren: For
some seven or eight years hence, when
your Bible shall be quite ended, (for un-
til the quite finishing of it, we cannot
have the benefit of it as a Judge,) then
your own Brethren must not trust your
judgment, judging for them in the choice
of the true Copy, picked now out of
one of your old Copies, now out of ano-
ther; now trusting to this old Copy
most in this Verse, and by and by not
trusting it most in the next, or almost
the next Verse. *The due use of reason* (say
they) permits us not to stand blindly to
the publick judgment, even of whole
General Councils, when they define mat-
ters of less moment, than is the taking
upon your word, our Judge in all Points
necessary to be believed or practised. For
though in the Second Council of *Nice An-*
no 787. no fewer than three Hundred and
Fifty Fathers, did allow of the Worship
of

cannot be our Judge in all points. 117

of Reliques and holy Images of Christ and his Saints *Acts*, 3: Yet we have the private judgment of discretion to judge for our selves, because we are to answer for our selves; and we (duly using our reason) judge Worship of Images to be either Idolatry or Superstition. Now, if you allow us, by your own Doctrine, not to trust a whole General Council of three Hundred and Fifty Ancient Fathers; you have not *the due use of reason* your selves, if you think we may lawfully blind our selves so far as to let you judge for us in a far more important Point; that is, in the taking the only Rule of our whole Faith upon your Judgment. I must, in this Point, have your leave not to accept of any one of your Copies, as sufficiently true, to be my Rule in my whole Faith, without I also can see the evidence of what I must assent unto: For so you teach me. See what I said in the very end of the Second Section. But I go on and confess that I see it is evident enough, that you do indeed say, that you give me the best Copies that can be got; and that, which is more, I see it is evident that you do indeed say all your Copies agree in things, which are necessary to salvation: But I do not, nor cannot see (though one among one Hundred thousand

118 *The Bible not containing all points,*
thousand be not so learned as I) that all
you say to me is evidently true, until
I have conferr'd all the Copies as well as
you; and until I be as fully certified of
the antiquity, and choice exactness of
all your Copies, as well as you: And this
is impossible for me, until I can under-
stand all those Languages as well as you;
and peruse all the authentical Testimo-
nies, which you have of this antiquity,
and perfect exactness of your Copies. Be-
sides all this, how can I trust you to
judge in all and every Point, whether
the agreement of all the Copies be ex-
act in all and every Point fundamental
and necessary to salvation: For I know,
we our selves cannot agree which be all
the Points fundamental and necessary;
and my Judgment may in this vastly
differ from yours, as much and as law-
fully as it differs from the Council I now
spoke of. Thus much your own Bre-
thren must be allow'd to say.

9. As for our parts, we, to say no-
thing of what you mention concerning
Beza, Munsterus and *Erasmus*, &c. (from
whom, as from professed Enemies, we
cannot without just suspicion receive any
thing) we I say, besides this, do not on-
ly suspect, but also evidently know that
you mainly disagree from us in under-
standing the Sense of your own words,
“ when

cannot be our Judge in all points. 119

“when you say *There is* (in all the Co-
“pies you have by you) *great agreement in*
“*all things belonging to Faith, and necessary*
“*to salvation, &c.* And more towards the
end, you say, *That they agree in Fundamen-*
“*tals.* Bishop *Usber*, (whose Copies you
profess to use so much) if he had gon
on with his work I spoke of n. 7. had
given us better satisfaction in this parti-
cular, in that we had seen how great, and
where the disagreements be: But you
make us rely wholly on your Authority
in this point; I know you could not
do otherwise. But as for your Judgment
in Fundamentals, we know not how to re-
ly on you; You tell us our Religion and
yours agree *in Fundamentals*: If your Co-
pies agree in Fundamentals no more than
our two Religions, this agreement will
be little to our satisfaction, nor much to
the satisfaction of many of your Bre-
thren: For being they know you account
all the Points, in which we and you
disagree, not to be Points Fundamen-
tal or necessary to salvation; They, by
your granting frequent disagreeing in
your Copies in Points not Fundamental,
are not freed from, but confirmed in the
suspicion which many have, That the
Copies of the Bible agree no better than
Papists and *Protestants*; and that (for any
thing they can yet judge by their own
Judgment

120 *The Bible not containing all points,*
judgment of discretion) these your Copies disagree about the Texts concerning Real Presence; the Popes Supremacy; Image-Worship; Prayer to Saints; and for the Dead; yea about our Justification it self; the number, the right use, the fruit, the necessity of Sacraments; and such Points as these are; which, tho' you account them not to be Fundamental, yet you account them of so great concernment, that the difference in these Points, gave you most just cause of separating and dividing from the *Roman Church*, with all those Scandals and publick evils ensuing upon this division. Will not then, this be a sufficient reason of not embracing the Copies Presented unto them in this most accurate Bible, they having no better assurance, that these Copies agree with those other Copies concealed from them, in these Points, (in which their greatest difference from the *Roman Church* do's consist) than the Authority of these Learned men, who most plainly confess the frequent differences of their Copies in Points not Fundamental, and who also, by the name of *points not Fundamental*, are known most commonly to mean such kind of Points, as contain no meaner differences than those which are between *Papists* and *Protestants*; and which caused this
great

cannot be our Judge in all points. 12^R

great Division. A word more of this Bible in the next Sect. N. 5.

10. To end then this matter, you see (Gentle Readers) That you have not among you any Copy, which you undoubtedly know, so much as by evidence of Human knowledge, to be Gods undoubted Word: Will you, who contend so eagerly to have nothing believed, for which there is not clear Scripture, have us, in the most important Point of belief, believe that for which we have neither Scripture, nor evidence of Human reason? If you say the Divine Providence would doubtless keep the Copies of the Originals uncorrupted, because otherwise we should have no sure Rule of Faith: I answer, that this is to suppose the very thing which is in question, *Whether Christ gave us Scripture for our only Rule.* Yea, because it is clear, that standing in Human evidence, no Copy can be freed of the guilt of Corruption: Therefore God would have no Copy at all to be our only Rule of Faith, but has provided for our Direction another way.

G

Sect :

Sect. 5.

A Ninth Argument, That the Scripture cannot decide this Controversie, Which Translations of the Word of God be true : And therefore Ordinary Protestants cannot believe Scripture with Divine Faith.

I. **T**He Divine goodness desiring passionately (as appears by his passion for all) the Salvation of all, and intending to make Faith a necessary means to this their Salvation, must consequently provide some means to guide and direct us to the truth of this Faith ; which must be a means so easy to be applyed by all, that all, by the use of this means, may (if they will) attain true Faith, which is *but one* ; for *Faith unless it be one is not Faith*, as St. Leo says *Ser. de Nativ.* Hence it appears, to the very eye, that if the Scripture cannot so be used by all (or the far greater part) as to guide themselves by it, in all Points necessary to Salvation ; it cannot be the only means given them for their guide in Points necessary to Salvation : But it cannot do this to the far greater part of the World, as I prove ; For the far greater part of the World cannot make use of Scripture in those Languages, in which

cannot be our Judge in all points. 123

which it was written, as has been shew'd in the last Section, even concerning men, who are more Learned, than any one among one Hundred Thousand; and it is in it self clear enough concerning those, who know not Greek, and Hebrew in any perfect degree of knowledge, in which Languages the Scripture was written; whence it follows, That the far greater part of the World, cannot know what the true Word of God (their only Judge and Director) did say, but by the means of a Translator or Interpreter. Now judge you, in what uncertainty that Man should be left, who would have a very good Guide lock'd up in some place, to which he himself could never have access, but must hear all the directions given him by some other Man who is exceedingly subject to mistake very many things which that good Guide should say to him; especially this Messenger being often to trust others of no undoubted credit: In this case, your own Doctrin do's put you (O dear People) who make Gods Word your only Guide, in a way full of a world of doubtful turnings, in which to miss is everlastingly to perish. This Word is lock'd up to in Hebrew and Greek Closets, that you cannot know what it says, but by the use of a Translator, as by a Messenger; who

G 2

being

124 *The Bible not containing all points,*

being a Man, and having a weak Understanding, and a Will subject not to take all the pains requir'd for the exact knowledge of all that, which the Word of God speaks, in so great a Book as the Bible is, in which there be very hard expressions in Languages nothing easie to be understood, in all Words and Phrases; especially, seeing that the Hebrew Tongue, was quite lost (for as much as concerns the vulgar use) in the Captivity of *Babylon*, some six hundred Years before Christ. How hard then must it be now to know the full force, which common use gave these words two or three and twenty hundred Years ago? What Skill can be known to be here secure? Besides the difficulty of the Points of which I have spoken; I say nothing of the wilful mistakes which this Messenger may commit, either fully on set purpose, to make all go the way which he conceives to be best, upon his passionate affection to it, or disaffection to the contrary; or rather, not so much with so plain downright wilfulness; as with an over-swaying prejudice, which has prepossess'd his Judgment, that the way which he, as from thy Guide, bids thee to go, is the only true way: Not that he is fully sure that thy Guide did clearly say so; but thy Messenger thought
best

cannot be our Judge in all points. 125

best to put down clearly this way for thy true way, because his own prejudice of its being so, and his great desire that it should be held by all to be so, have prevail'd with him to deliver it clearly to be so. Moreover, this thy Translator or Messenger had not immediate access to Gods Word, in that very Hand-writing; in which it was written by the Scripture-writer, from such; but what he knows, he knows Copies as were written by Men of unknown Fidelity, who, perhaps often were such hireling Pen-men as had more care to write much, that they might gain much; than to write with all perfect exactness, and to take due pains and care in conferring their Transcrib'd Copies with the Copies they Transcrib'd. And those very Copies also were perhaps written out with the like carelessness. Besides this carelessness, Ignorance might likewise cause many a mistake in so long a Work, because all, neither knew the Languages perfectly which they Transcrib'd, nor did not, perhaps, know so cunningly, those Abbreviations which those Pen-men us'd even almost at every word; in which also one Writer often differs from another: Hence in a long Work numberless mistakes are incident, which soon grow to a far greater number, whilst so many subsequent Transcribers

126 *The Bible not containing all points,*

out of former Mistakers come to add their new mistakes to those former. And to do it in a Hand fit to cause their mistakes to be yet more multiply'd, when more Copies (subject still to the like inconvenience) come to be transcrib'd out of them successively for many Ages. Now thy Messenger or Translator, in this vast variety of Copies, (of which we spoke more in the last Chapter) if he finds but one or two Copies, which more favor that way which he would have all go, or thinks in his private Judgment to be true; he makes choice to Interpret this mistaken Copy for Gods own Word, and sets it down as advantageously as he can, to further his Opinion and his desire to bring such a way into greatest request. From such Men as these, you are immediately to take that direction for your only Rule and Guide: And yet, tho' you see with your Eyes, your only direction to come so indirectly to you; and that you most manifestly, neither do here judge for your selves, nor can possibly judge for your selves in this Capital Point (comprehending all the Points you are to believe;) yet you are taught by all your prime Doctors, that, as you are to answer to God for your selves in all you believe; so you must by your selves also, judge for your selves in all you believe.

cannot be our Judge in all points. 127

believe. Yet (O preposterous! O monstrously preposterous!) you, in this chiefest Point of all, must rely upon the Authority a few English Translators; who exact of you to rely on them with more confidence than they will permit you to rely upon the Authority of a whole General Council, seconded by the Authority of the gravest Fathers which the Church of God has had: And you, who are taught to follow and believe nothing but Scripture, are now taught without any one Text of Scripture to take the Translations of Men for your only Guides, in all and every Point of your Faith; and such Translations also as we just now described, and shall here more fully describe. In the mean time note, that here I have one more necessary Point, not clearly set down in Scripture, to add to the former sixteen. If any deny this Point to be necessary to Salvation, let him answer this Argument, That is necessary to Salvation, without which I cannot come to be assuredly guided to true Faith; but I (who understand not both Greek and Hebrew) cannot, without a truly Translated Bible, come to be assuredly guided to true Faith, the true Bible being (as you teach me) the only Rule guiding and directing to true Faith; Therefore it is necessary for me, to use a

128 *The Bible not containing all points,*
truly Translated Bible ; but no Scripture
do's direct me in the choice of a truly
Translated Bible ; therefore Scripture
do's not direct me in all Points necessary
for me to Salvation.

2. Here again, I infer, that all that
vast number of People, who, knowing
not perfectly both Greek and Hebrew, are
forc'd not to judge for themselves which
is the true Word of God, must of ne-
cessity rely upon many uncertainties
in this very Point, upon which all
their whole Faith do's rely. First, they
must rely upon this uncertainty, whether
the Copy which this Translated Bible
do's interpret to them, were a true Copy
of the true uncorrupted Word of God ;
which, how great an uncertainty it is,
has been shewed in the last Section ;
where I shew'd also (and here you may
see it again) how much more you take
your Religion upon trust, than we do ;
even those great Doctors, who now set
forth the famous Bible, Confess (in *their*
Introduction) that *Copies are only so far Gods*
true Word, as they agree with the true Ori-
ginal Copy, written by the Prophets or A-
postles. How your Translators Copy a-
grees with the true Original, God
knows ; I am sure, you know not, nor
your Translator himself. *Secondly, It is*
uncertain, whether your Translator did
in

cannot be our Judge in all points. 129

in every place interpret sincerely, and not follow his own private Opinions, in expressing some Points of Controversie. *Thirdly, It is uncertain,* whether he were not in several places of so great a work, careless to express the true Sense of his Copy, not marking at all times attentively enough, or not using at all times due labor to search for the true Sense of such and such a Word, in such and such a place. *Fourthly, It is uncertain,* whether your Translators Skill was great enough to perform his duty in so vast a Work as the Translation of the Bible is, even tho' he should use as great pains as he could. A Faith relying upon so many uncertainties, for certain cannot but be uncertain; but all the Faith, which such Protestants have, is thus uncertain, unless they have Skill and Will to use the Hebrew and Greek Bible: Therefore their Faith is not Certain nor Divine in any one Point, because in all Points they rely upon a Translators Authority, which is subject to so many uncertainties. See this clearly confess'd by prime Protestant Doctors; whose words I give you hereafter, *Seet. 16. N. 7.*

3. And, that you may see this the clearer, I will set before your Eyes, several undeniable proofs of the gross falsity which is in the Translators of your own Religion,

130 *The Bible not containing all points,*
gion, in whom you trust most; that
hence you may see, how little they are
to be trusted by you in so great a matter;
especially to be trusted more than a Ge-
neral Council. *Luther* (that great begin-
ner of this Reformation) did set forth a
Translation, which, how good it was
you shall hear from your great Doctor
Zuinglius, *Lib. de Sacra. fol. 412.* *Luther*
was (says he) *a foul corrupter and horrible*
falsifier of Gods Word. *One who followed the*
Marcionists and Arians, that razed out
such places of Holy Writ as were against him.
Thou dost (says he to *Luther*) *corrupt the*
Word of God, thou art seen to be a manifest
and common corrupter and perverter of the
Holy Scriptures. *How much are we asham'd*
of thee who have hitherto esteem'd thee, &c.
And *Luther* himself, twenty years after,
confess'd he had often err'd, because he
had trusted too much the Glosses of the
Rabbins; as witnesseth *Cochlæus in actis*
Lutheri. Behold here another way for
Translators to err, of which we thought
not before. It is also worth the noting
which *Bellarmin* in his Sermon upon *Pen-
tecost*, says of *Luther*, *Those* (says he) *who*
most diligently have read the Books of Lu-
ther, do bear witness, that he, in the New
Testament only (so small a part of the
Bible) *has chang'd above a thousand places.*
He did set forth the Gospels seven times, e-
very

cannot be our Judge in all points. 131

very time most different from all the former, as the same Bellarmin there noteth. So much for *Luther*. After him came *Zuinglius*, and set forth a Bible, with the help of his Disciples, which being Printed at *Zurich*, the Printer sent one of them to *Luther*; but he rejecting it, sent it him back again, as you may see in the *Protestants Apologie*, Tract. 1. S. 10. Subd. 4. out of which place I cannot but add divers most pertinent things to our present purpose. This Apologie then sets down all that here follows; as that *Luther* said of those *Zuinglian* Translators, *That they were Fools, Asses, Antichrists, Deceivers, and of an Ass-like Understanding.* That *Beza* reproves the Translation of *Oecolampadius* (who with *Zuinglius* and *Carlostadius* did first begin your Reformation in point of the Real Presence:) He them having set forth his Bible at *Basil*, *Beza* said thus of it, *The Basilian Translation is in many places wicked, and altogether differing from the mind of the Holy Ghost.* The same great *Beza* accounts that so highly esteem'd Translation of *Castalio*, to be *Sacrilegious, Wicked and Ethnical.* But *Castalio* was quit with *Beza*, for he writ a whole Book against the Translation which *Beza* made, saying, *That to note all his Errors (in Translating) would require a great Volume.* But *Beza* in his Annotations,

132 *The Bible not containing all points,*
Annotations, go's on, and calls *Castalio's*
Translation *False, Foolish, Unskilful, Bold,*
Blasphemous, Vitiuous, Ridiculous, Cursed, Er-
roneous, Wicked, Perverse. Hitherto thou
seest these Translations of thy prime Do-
ctors condemn'd by the Authority of o-
ther no less famous Translators. And
both those who were condemn'd thus,
and who did thus condemn, were Men
more famous among you than is any one
Translator of any one English Bible; so
that a greater Authority, than is the Au-
thority of that Man (whose Translation
you take for the only Rule of Faith) tells
you, that Translations of far more Learn-
ed Translators than yours, are so full of
Corruptions, that great Volumes would
not contain them: How then can you
hope that your less skilful English
Translator ha's done his part better
than any of your greatest Doctors. But
I must yet further ask you, how you
know this on your own knowledge?
And how is it possible for you here to
judge for your self, which your Doctors
so often tell you, you shall be able to do
if you will follow them? Do not you
here again see, how in a most important
Point, you are enforce'd to trust an in-
comparable less Authority than that
is of any one of our General Coun-
cils, which they so strictly charge you
not

cannot be our Judge in all points. 133

not to trust even in far less Points? Or blindness!

4. But you cannot but see how much you are gull'd herein, and how impossible it is for you to judge of Truth and Faith by these English Translations, when you shall yet hear what I have to say of them. *Your first English Bible* was set forth in the days of *Henry the Eighth* by *Tindal*, whom yours esteem *the Apostle of England* in this Reformation. May I not trust him; will you say? Truly *Bishop Tunstal* noted no less than *two thousand Corruptions* in his Translation in the *New Testament* only, as witnesseth the *Remish Testament* in the end of the *Table of certain places*, &c. How little a part of the Bible is the *New Testament*? And yet *two thousand Corruptions* in that only? Yet surely in *Queen Elizabeth's Days*, who liv'd so very long, and did see the Gospel so well perfected, our Translations (wilt thou say) were compleatly exact: For then, if ever our Doctors had the true Spirit. Indeed then they were so confident their Translations did agree with the Word of God, that the Queen (whom all your Doctors by Oath acknowledge Governess of your Church in *England*) in the 26. Year of her Reign (as *Sir Rich. Baker* writes in that Year) did command *Whitgift* her Archbishop of *Cant.* to set forth three

134 *The Bible not containing all points,*
three Articles to be subscribed by all her
Clergy, and the second of these was, *That*
the Book of Common Prayer contains nothing
contrary to the Word of God. By reason of
the urging this Subscription, many
marking well, that in their *Common-*
Prayer their *Epistles, Gospels, Psalms, &c.*
were contain'd, all which were taken
out of their Bible; and knowing by their
learning, that their Bible, even then,
was full of gross Corruptions, contrary
to the Word; began now openly to dis-
cover these Errors. Hence divers Mini-
sters in a Treatise to her Excellent Ma-
jesty, spoke thus, *Our Translation of the*
Psalms, comprized in our Book of Com-
mon Prayer, do's in Addition, Subtra-
ction, and Alteration, differ from the Truth
of the Hebrew in Two hundred places at least.
And Mr. Burges in his Apology S. 6.
writes thus, *How shall I approve under my*
hand, a Translation which has many Omissions,
many Additions, which sometimes obscures,
sometimes perverts the Sense, being sometimes
senseless, sometimes contrary. And Carliel
faith in his Book of Christs descent to Hell.
P. 116. *The Translators thereof (the English*
Bible then used) have depraved the Sense,
or obscured the Truth, and deceived the Igno-
rant. In many places, they detort the Scrip-
ture from the right Sense; and finally, they shew
themselves to love darkness more than Light,
falsehood

cannot be our Judge in all points. 135
falsehood more than Truth. When King
James began now to Reign, the Ministers
of *Lincolnshire*, in an Abridgment of a
Book deliver'd to the King, P. 11. 12. of
the *English Translation* speak thus, *It*
takes away from the Text, adds to the Text,
and this sometimes to the changing or obscur-
ing of the meaning of the Holy Ghost: A
Translation which is absurd, and sense-
less, perverting in many places the mean-
ing of the Holy Ghost. These things
were so notorious, that Sir *Richard Baker*,
an earnest Old Protestant (as now they
call them) in the first Year of King
James his Reign, writes thus, He called
to *Hampton Court* divers of his Bishops and
Divines, to see what they could say against
the present Government of the *English*
Church. In this Conference, D. *Reynolds*
mentioned, that there might be a New Tran-
slation of the Bible; because the present Tran-
slations were Corrupt, and not answerable to
the Truth of the Original; whereof he alledg-
ed divers Examples, particularly that
in the Hundred and fifth Psalm, v. 28.
where it is said, *They were not Obedient;*
in the Original, it is, *They were not Disobe-*
dient: To this it was agreed, that a New
Translation should be made. Thus far
Sir *Richard* word for word. By all which
it is evident, that your Bishops, Doctors,
Divines, &c. In Queen *Elizabeths* days,
even

136 *The Bible not containing all points,*
even to her last day, did subscribe, and
by Publick Authority were ordered to
subscribe that falsifying Word of God, to
be the true Word of God; tho' it were
flatly contrary (as in the place now cited)
to the true Word. How know you that
the Divines now, tho' they miss not al-
ways in the same places perhaps, yet per-
haps they may miss in others of as great
consequence? The Scripture was held
then as confidently to be the only Rule
of Faith, and cited as fast, and as thick,
for Gods Word then, as it is now: And
yet, now your very Bible coming forth
on that occasion, do's as good as tell you
the former Bible was not Gods true
Word. Divers Years after the resoluti-
on made of setting forth this New Bible,
there still remain'd such open complaints
of the Corruptions of the Word of God,
that Mr. Broughton (a Man as skilful in
Hebrew and Greek as any was in *England*)
according to his skill, did give this Cen-
sure in his *Advertisements of Corruptions to*
the Bishops; saying, *That their publick Tran-*
slation of Scriptures into English; is such,
as it perverteth the Text of the Old Testament,
in Eight hundred forty eight places, and that it
causeth millions of millions to reject the New
Testament, and to run to eternal Flames. In
what case then has this your Doctrin put
you, which hath taken you off from
following

cannot be our Judge in all points. 137

following the Judgment of the Church in a General Council, to make you Judge for your own selves: When your learn'd Divines (who made so corrupted Translations) did so ill judge for them and others? Upon thy self then, thou can'st not safely rely in this point, neither can'st thou rely upon thy Translators, who have used thee thus: Find me then, for Gods sake, find me, if thou can'st, any where any, but half so sure a Ground, as is that of the Church, which is the *Pillar and Ground of Truth*. Thou do'st not only venture the being deceived in this great Point of the uprightness of thy only Rule and Judge; but it is manifest, that thou art deceived: For thy Rule (which is thy present *English* Translated Bible) still stands accused of many and gross Corruptions. Not to trouble thee much, I will tell thee only of one or two, Thy Translator had a mind to make thee believe, that Faith only could save thee; A damnable Doctrine, unknown to the greatest Doctors of the Church, which could not be, were it the only thing which did justify and save us, as thy Translator would perswade thee, when Translating what *Christ* said to the blind man, whom he cured, *Luke 18. 43.* he makes *Christ* to say, *thy Faith saved thee*, in place of saying, *thy Faith has made thee whole.*

138 *The Bible not containing all points, whole.* Again, tho' *Christ*, by way of Counsel, did propose in a general manner, the embracing of a chaste single Life, *Mat. 19. v. 11 and 12.* saying, *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it:* Thy Translator had a mind to make thee believe, not only that every one did not receive this Doctrin, but he makes *Christ* in the former verse tell us, *All Men cannot receive this saying.* Whereas *Christ* said only, *All men do not receive this saying*, as is evident out of the Greek. Is this fair dealing? Is it all one to say, *All men do not lead single Lives*; and to say, *All men cannot lead single Lives*, tho' they use Fasting, Praying, &c. This is as wilful an Error, as it would be in one who heard me say (and also set it down in Writing to prevent mistake) *All men are not honest*, should report that I said, *All men cannot be honest.* When I see a Translator not to make any Conscience of so wilfully falsifying Gods own Word, in favour of his own Opinion; have not I just Reason to say, I cannot be sure of my Faith in all Points, if I (upon this Mans Authority) take his Translation as the only Rule of my Faith in all Points? What more clear?

5. Here I must needs examine the Doctrin, which those great Masters of the ancient Languages, who now set forth that

cannot be our Judge in all points. 139

that mighty work of the *London Bible*, in so many learned ancient Languages, who in the Introduction to this their Bible (of which I spoke in the last, *Seet. N. 8.*) spoke thus, *It is not necessary for the producing Faith in the People, that there should be a Translation wholly infallible; seeing that de facto it is evident, that among those numberless Translations, which are extant this day in Europe, there is none of all them which is of divine and infallible Authority: For Faith do's rely on the authority or veracity of God, which always is certain and infallible, alth'o all the means be not infallible; For Translations have only so far Authority, as far as they agree with the first own-hand written Original: But they are sufficient means of Faith, when they contain (who knows when that is) all things necessary to Salvation, without any Error against Faith or good manners: So they. Let us examin what they say by parts, as it lies in order, and that in order to our present purpose only; and not in order to Examine how true all they say is. If true Faith can be had now, without any infallible Translation, then the Bible is not our only Guide to true Faith, and our only Judge in points controverted in Faith; for this Judge must be infallible, as all your Doctors teach. If you answer, the Judge is not the Translated Copy, but the Original in Greek and Hebrew.*

I ask you, what shall almost all the world do to hear this infallible Judge? For almost all are deaf to all that is spoken in Greek and Hebrew. If there be not one infallible Translation in Europe at this day; how at this day are all deluded, who are taught on the one side to judge for themselves, and on the other side are told that they cannot handle the Ruler by which they should Rule their Judgment in all Points: But they must be contented with a fallible Lesbian Rule of Lead, bent as it pleased the Translator? Again, how is it possible God should bid the People to search the Truth in the Bible; not only as the only place to find it in; but also as the only place for them to find it in: For God knew all People could not search Truth in any Bibles, but such as are Translated into a Language they understand; God knew all these Translations were Liars, if indeed they be so as you say. Can God bid any Man seek for the Truth, only at a Liars Mouth? Yea, would God, who loves Souls so well, give them no better means to know the Truth wholly necessary to Salvation? True it is, Faith do's rely upon the Truth of God, who said such a thing to be so and so; but if my Translator tell me that God said such a thing was so and so; and yet God said no such thing, but an other:

cannot be our Judge in all points. 141

other thing very different, in place of which, my Translator ignorantly or wilfully obtrudes this thing; here manifestly I am left leaning, with all my force upon a Lie. And whereas you tell us, that *Translations* (the only Rule we can handle) *have only so far Divine Authority as far as they agree with the first own Hand-written Originals*; This is small comfort to us, to whom it is impossible to know how far this is. Yea, your selves know not which be the true own-hand-written-Originals, which you confess to have perill'd, tho' you say, that they be faithfully restor'd by your laborious gathering and conferring together more exquisite Copies than hitherto have been publish'd; which, how true it is, I know not. And then Secondly, without we also know the Languages, which you present unto us very faithfully, (as we perhaps purpose,) it is impossible for us to know how far our Translations agree with the Originals; therefore it is impossible for us to know how far we may trust to their Authority as Divine, or suspect it as Human. And so by clear consequence it is impossible for us to know when and where we may give a most full undoubted assent to what we find Translated in our Bibles. Is this the comfort you leave us at last, when, upon our leaving
to

142. *The Bible not containing all points,*
to rely upon the Rock of the Church,
you promis'd to make us Men, knowing
what we do in all Points; And now,
we are sure we know not what we do in
any? For we know not what our only
Rule bids us to hold upon Gods Authority,
or what that Man bids upon his Authority
only to hold, when offering us
own Translation, he bids us take it for a
Divine Rule; which, if he gives not, we
are gull'd even in that Point which nearest
concerns our Salvation. Indeed, you
conclude with a small crum of comfort,
when you tell us, *Translations are sufficient
means to Divine Faith, when they contain
all things necessary to Salvation, without any
Error against Faith or Good-manners.* But
I pray reflect, how wholly impossible it
is for us to tell when they do this, without
knowing first for certain all the
Points necessary to Salvation: About
which, you your selves are not yet agreed,
neither can you give us up a List or
Catalogue of them. Nay, I may affirm,
that no such List or Catalogue can be
giv'n, (tho' even here it be so apparently
necessary) that thence we might see whether
there be any such Error in our English
Bibles, in those matters: Yea, all of
you tell us, that there is no way to
know what is necessary to Salvation, but
by the true Bible; and yet we (poor
Souls)

cannot be our Judge in all points. 143

Souls) cannot possibly come to know, which is the true Bible containing all Points necessary to Salvation, without any Error of Faith or Manners, until we know first, that a true Bible has told us so. And again, we cannot know that Bible to be so true, which told us so; until we know, that that very Bible contain'd all Points necessary to Salvation, without any Error in Faith or Manners. This is not only to blind us (as you say the Papists do, when they make us follow the Church :) but it is to use us as the *Philistians* us'd *Sampson*; first to put out our Eyes, and then to make us run round in a Mill, as blind Horses do in Horse-mills: For no Circle is rounder, and go's more about and about again in the same Footsteps, than the Circle we are made run in blindfold; by having no other assurance, that the only Rule of all our Faith is a Bible, containing all things necessary to Salvation, without Error against Faith and Manners; and having no other assurance of what is necessary to Salvation, what not; what is against Faith, what not; what is against Manners, what not; but by another Bible, of which Bibles Truth we have no other assurance than the former; but we still require another Bible to assure us of the like things; and this other will require

144 *The Bible not containing all points,*
quire yet another, and so without end.
What Circle can be more endless?

S E C T. VI.

A Tenth Argument, That the Scripture cannot decide the Controversie about the truth of St. Matthew's Gospel. And that our Adversaries do not believe this Gospel with Divine Faith.

HERE also I must needs propose a difficulty, which, in the Principles of your Religion, I conceive to be unanswerable. You do no less believe all things written in St. *Matthew's Gospel*, than you believe all things written in any other Book of the Scripture: But even your Doctors of the highest Form, have no other Authority for all things in St. *Matthew's Gospel*, but the Authority of a Translation made by one, whom none of us all know; and so we can neither assure our selves of his Fidelity, nor of his Skill, nor of his care to use a true Copy, nor I of his Industry in the use thereof, &c. Now you tell us (and it is true) that Translations (prescinding from any Decree of the Church approving of them) have only so far Authority, as far as they agree with the true Original: But it is impossible for you (great Doctors) to know, how far the
Translated

cannot be our Judge in all points. 145

translated Copies of *St. Matthews Gospel* agree with the Original; because for these many Ages, there has not been known extant in the whole world, any one Copy of the Original-hand-writing of *St. Matthew*, who did write in that kind of Hebrew which the *Jews* spoke in his days, as all and every one of the Ancient Fathers (who have writ of this matter, and whose Works we have) do testifie: And *S. Jerom libro de Scriptorib. Ecclesiasticis* affirms himself to have seen, and to have also written out that Hebrew Copy. But for these many Ages no one Hebrew Copy has appear'd in the World, which with any sufficient probability, could be shewed to be a True Copy; whence it is evident, that none of you all can tell, how far the Translations we have of that Hebrew Copy, do agree with the Hebrew Copy; therefore, not one of you all can tell, how far these Translations, which we have now, be of Divine Authority, and how far now we may admit them as Gods undoubted word; there being no reason known to us, why we should admit them more in one place (upon *St. Matthews Authority*) than in another; and there being no reason why we should admit of the whole Translation, made by I know not whom, rather than of other Translations, whom

H

we

146 *The Bible not containing all points,*

we know, to have been made with all the best industries which Human ability can afford; whence I can neither admit the whole Translation as Divine, nor any part of it, rather than the part I admit not, I not knowing any one part to agree more with the true Original, than the other. All the whole Gospel I cannot receive as Divine, for no Translation at all, (much less the Translations of a Man unknown) is to be admitted as Divine and infallible, there being no one such in all *Europe* as you say. Hence I demonstrate, that you believe not *St. Matthews* Gospel with Divine Faith: For you cannot say, that you give Credit to any one thing in it for the Authority of the writer of it, because you know not any one thing delivered from God by the Writer unto you, but upon the Authority of the Translation, which is no farther Divine than agreeing with the true Copy; which agreement you neither know to be in this one Point, or any other you can name. How can I know, how the Translation agrees with the Original, if I know not what the Original saith?

2. Again, to believe *St. Matthews* Gospel, is as necessary to Salvation, as to believe *St. Lukes* or *St. Johns*; but no infallible Scripture (Translations not being Infallible) do's tell you that *St. Matthews* Gospel

cannot be our Judge in all points. 147

pel is the undoubted Word of God : How will you then prove this by Scripture against the *Marcionists*, the *Cerdonists*, and the *Manicheans*, who deny this Gospel to be Gods Word? All Points necessary to Salvation, you say, are plainly set down in Scripture ; Shew me this Point plainly set down. Here then I have one necessary Point more, not plainly set down in Scripture which makes the former Seventeen Points to be Eighteen. Neither can you say, that, by the very reading this Translation, you can discover a light, shewing it, as clearly as the Sun, to be Gods Word : For tho' I can see no reason, why such light might not be discovered, as well in True Translations, as in True Originals ; yet because you of your Religion, who only have eyes to see this light, do profess (as we have lately seen your greatest Scripture Doctors to profess) that there is not one Infallible Translation in *Europe* ; and because we see, even such Doctors as they are, not so much as to hope to discover, by such a light, true Translations from false ones ; but to bestow great pains in conferring the several Copies of their several Translations, with the bests Copies of the Originals which they can find ; and by the agreeing, or not agreeing with these best Copies, to approve or reprove these

148 *The Bible not containing all points,*
Translations; we are by this certify'd,
that they trust nothing to this clear
Light, which if it were a reality, and
not a real Phansie, were the best guide
of all, and would save them infinite
pains: Yea, whatsoever (to avoid our
Arguments) they boast of this Light,
which yet even in the approving or re-
proving the Copies of the Original it
self, they trust nothing to it. If I
thought, they did trust to such an un-
grounded Imagination, neither I, nor
any one of my Opinion (nor of thine
neither, as I think) would ever buy one
Copy of their Translations.

3. Now, if you cannot discover any
such Light assuring you of the truth of all
things in St. *Matthew's* Gospel, I am sure
you cannot do so in St. *John's* or St. *Luke's*,
or any other: And your own Conscien-
ces cannot but tell you, that the Light
discovering its self in St. *Matthew*, is as
great as in any other Book of Scripture;
but this Light is now clearly shew'd to be
unsufficient to prove St. *Matthew's* Gospel
to be Divine, it being only a Translation
which your best Doctors confess to be fal-
lible; neither is there any means to
know one part of it to be more Infallible
than another, upon the Authority of the
Writer thereof; because we know not
which part agrees with the true Copy of
the

cannot be our Judge in all points. 149

the Writer. You say you fix your Faith upon what is Translated, and not upon the Translation: But, I say, if you fix your Faith upon what is Translated by a false Translator, you may soon fix your Faith upon a Lie; at least you cannot tell when you do so, and when you do not; for you know not whether the thing deliver'd be agreeable to Gods Word, or only to the Interpreters Fancy; especially when you know not of what credit the Interpreter is. Do you know it because your Fancy also tells you, this is Gods Word? Then thus we may have a double fantastical assurance, and nothing else; one from the unknown Interpreters Fancy, another from thy own. I thought your Faith had relied on Gods written Word. What written Word is that which can neither be shew'd assuredly written in any Original, nor in any Copy, nor in any Translation of the Original Copy? If you fly at last to that miserable shift, as to say, that the Illumination of the Spirit can tell you Gods Word, without the Mediation of any certain undoubted means, conveying it unto you; then you must needs be Prophets all, and every one of you. Who ever heard of such a Church in this World, in which there be as many Prophets as there be Men and Women?

150 *The Bible not containing all points,*
This is not the Church of St. Paul, in which he said, 1 Cor. 12, 19. Be all Prophets? And in which he gave only some Prophets, Eph. 4. 11. But all of you, who know immediately from God, that which no mediate means conveigheth unto you, must needs be true Prophets. If this be true, then also any English Clown, by the like Illumination, communicated to him in the reading of his English Translation, may as well, and better, (because by Divine Illumination) be assur'd, that all is true which is in his English Translated Bible; and so, by good consequence, be assur'd that it is a very true Translation, tho' he neither knew Greek nor Hebrew. And indeed, your Greek and Hebrew only helps you to confer the Translation with the Originals; but St. Matthew's Original Copy not being for many Ages visible in the World, can be no more conferr'd with by your Hebreicians, than by this English Clown: And if his Illumination assures him of all that is written in St. Matthew's Gospel; we will all, with one consent, grant, that it may assure him as well that all other parts of the Scriptures be Gods Word. What then need you talk of conferring with the Originals, or knowing Greek or Hebrew?

4. Now

cannot be our Judge in all points. 151

4. Now at last, I hope, when you so universally allow to every Man and Woman who believes St. Matthew's Gospel, so large a measure of Divine Illumination, that it is sufficient to ground an Infallible Belief; You will confess your selves to speak most inconsequently, if you offer to deny the like Illumination to the whole Church representative in a General Council: So now we shall have a Church Infallible; which is all I am endeavoring here by degrees to prove. And tell me not, that you are not assur'd, whether they in Councils have us'd the due means to obtain this Illumination; for I shall as easily tell you, that neither I, nor my Brethren, be assur'd, that you, and your Brethren, have us'd also the due means to obtain this Illumination concerning every Book, Chapter and Verse of Scripture, assuring them all to be Gods Word; especially when they speak contradictions so fast as we see they do.

H 45

Seet.

Sect. 7.

An Eleventh Argument, That the Scripture cannot decide the manifold Controversies about the true Sense of the Scripture: Therefore in their belief of the true Sense thereof, our Adversaries have no Divine Faith; nor no sure ground of their Religion.

IN the former Sections I have given you Eighteen Points, all necessary to Salvation, and yet not one of them plainly set down in Scripture: Now I add a Nineteenth Point, which, tho' most necessary, yet, it is so far from being clear'd by only Scripture, that almost all our Controversies do arise from hence, without ever being silenced by the definitive Sentence of God, deliver'd in the Bible: An evident sign that God, in the Scripture only, has not pass'd the clear Decisive Sentence of all necessary Controversies: For all Parties submit unto that Sentence, and yet none of them is clearly cast thereby. They do then the Holy Scripture much wrong, who say, that God did write it on purpose to end all Controversies; and yet they cannot possibly shew how God ha's done this compleatly:

cannot be our Judge in all points. 153

completely: And so, by consequence, they are driven (to the scandal of all Christians) to make God fall short of effecting that by Scripture, which they say he intended to effect; to wit, the ending of all Controversies; which with our Eyes we all see wax endless, even among those, who all submit to Scripture as Gods Word. We *Roman Catholics* are far from doing the Holy Ghost this wrong: We say, Scripture was dictated by him, for many most high ends belonging to the Knowledge and Love of God, and belonging to the encrease of all Vertue and hatred of Sin, arming us with Patience in Gods Service, by proposing most comfortable Motives to us: So *St. Paul* teaches us, *What things soever have been written, to our Learning they are written, that by the Patience and Consolation of the Scriptures we may have hope*, and thus walking cheerfully by those comfortable Examples, and these rare Documents, and fervent Exhortations given us in Scripture to all Vertue, we may gain the end for which God made us. Yea, we add, that Scripture wants not this Honor of providing sufficiently for our unity in Faith, about all Points which can ever fall in Controversies; not that it ends all these by it self alone; but that it bids us have our recourse, in these Cases, to his Church, and

154 *The Bible not containing all points,*
to bear her, and that under pain of being
accounted as a Publican or Heathen; and tel-
ling us, That the Gates of Hell shall not pre-
vail against her, by any false Doctrin; tel-
ling us, That she is the Pillar and Ground of
Truth; that he is with her all days even to
the consummation of the World; and that he
has pray'd his Father to give her another Com-
forter, that he may abide with her for ever,
the Spirit of Truth, who shall teach and suggest
unto her all things whatsoever Christ has
taught his Apostles, guiding her into all Truth.
He tells us also that he has given us such
Doctors, and such Pastors, as may secure
her from circumvention of Error; for his
Covenant with her is this, *My Spirit which*
is upon thee, and the words which I have put
in thy Mouth; shall not depart out of thy
Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed, nor
out of the Mouth of thy Seeds Seed, from hence
forth and for ever. And that her Sun shall
no more go down; for the Lord will be unto her
an everlasting light; she shall be a Kingdom
standing for ever; that the Nation and King-
dom which shall not serve her, shall perish. No
National Synods shall justify any Nati-
ons Division from her Communion. All
these Texts I shall shew to be spoken of
the Church; by which (I think) it is as
apparent by Scripture, that God in-
tended not in Controversies of Faith, to
instruct us by Scripture only; the very
Scripture

cannot be our Judge in all points. 295

Scripture sending us so often to the Church, as also to her Traditions; as 2. *Thes.* 2. 15. *Hold ye fast, and (to do this) hold the Traditions which ye have Learned, whether by word, or by Epistle:* And again, 2. *Tim.* 2. *The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses (he saith not by his writing only) these commend to faithful men, which shall be fit to teach others also.* And again, *Those things which ye have been taught, and heard, and seen in me, these do.* Who sees not that we were to do, not only what we had read, but what had been taught us, and what we had only heard or seen shining in publick practice. But of this hereafter see in the next Sect. N. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. God then teacheth us all things necessary in Scripture; first, by delivering many things clearly in it; Secondly, by sending us for the rest to the Church, and to her Traditions: By the Churches Pastors alone he instructed some sufficiently in Faith; as he did *St. Paul*, to whom it was said *Act.* 9. 6. *Go into the City, and it shall be told thee what thou must do;* and as he did *Cornelius*, to whom it was likewise said; *Call for one Simon, whose Surname is Peter, and he will tell thee what thou ought'st to do.* *Act.* 10. v. 5. 6. What you object to the contrary I answer Sect. 10. N. 6.

2. I return

156 *The Bible not containing all points,*

2. I return to you, who say, God intended by Scripture only to teach us all necessary Points; which if he has not done, you make him deficient in an unworthy manner: And that he has not done it I have already shew'd in eighteen necessary Points: And now I add, that by Scripture alone he do's not teach us the true Sense of Scripture: And yet the true Sense thereof is that which must give Sentence in the decision of all controversies; the Sense is the Kernel, the life, the Soul of the Text; miss that, miss all; A wrong and false Sense is no less dangerous than a false Text obtruded for a true one. Hence *Tertul: De Præscrip: The Sense adulter'd is like perilous as the file corrupted.* And St. *Jerom Ep. Ad Gal.* saith. *The Gospel is not in the Word but in the Sense; not in the Bark, but in the Sap.* Wherefore Dr. *Reynolds* in his Conference with Mr. *Hart*. P. 58. confesseth, *That it is not the shew but the Sense of the Words, that must decide Controversies.* So he. It is not then the Text as it sounds, but the Text thus Expounded, which must end (as you say) all our debates: And yet this Expounding thus or thus, is that very thing which first makes all our prime debates and Controversies; and it is also that very thing which makes them to be endless. *This I still inculcate, because.*

3. This,

cannot be our Judge in all points. 157.

3. This, and the true reason of this, is exceedingly to be noted; For it is not the Text, but the Text thus or thus Expounded; which is to decide Controversies: Not the Dead letter, but the true Sense of it, delivers the Sentence of the Holy Ghost. The Text, as Expounded by private judgments, is not to be held Gods undoubted Word; unless we first know the interpretation thereof to be indeed true, and agreeing wholly to the mind of the Holy Ghost; which to know is a thing wholly impossible without a Revelation; and yet, until we come to know this, we shall neither have reason to agree in one inward Faith interiorly, nor in one outward profession exteriorly; But still our hearts and lips will be divided. This we see, as clearly as noon-day-light, happen among those who take Scripture only for their Judge; which all Hereticks did ever use, and will ever use to do so, to escape being condemned or cast by any other Judgment-Seat. Hence they all still appeal to Scripture; for then they know beforehand all that can be said; and know also by what interpretations to shew, all that can be brought out of Scripture against them, not to be spoken by God in any Sense contrary to the Opinion they hold. And thus contrary Opinions, grounded in contrary
interpreta-

158 *The Bible not containing all points,*
interpretations, are held, and will be
held until the Worlds end; if there be
no other Judge to end them, but the Sen-
tence given by God in the Text of Scrip-
ture, not as the Text sounds, but as the In-
terpreter Expounds. Here with all possible
care I would have you note, that all the
Faith which our Adversaries have, rely-
ing on their Interpretations, which are
fallible, can be but fallible and Human:
For they believe, all that they believe,
because they fully perswade themselves,
that, God says that thing in the Scripture
taken not meerly as the words sound, but
taken as they verily apprehend and judge
the true interpretation to be so, or so.
This is the ground of their belief in all
Points; and therefore this is Fundamen-
tal to their Religion; and that as pro-
perly as any thing can be called Funda-
mental to any Religion: For it is the
foundation it self on which every single
Point of their belief, and their whole be-
lief in general is so wholly built, that they
rest upon nothing but this. Where first
I observe, that you and we must needs
differ in the most Fundamental Point
which concerns Religion: For we believe
nothing at all, because by our private
Judgment only we judge it to be the truly
interpreted Sense of Scripture; but be-
cause we know it interpreted so by the
Church

cannot be our Judge in all points. 159

Church, assisted by the Holy Ghost in all her publick interpretations. You will believe no one Point (for example, that there is a Trinity,) for this reason only; because forsooth you hold the Church fallible in her publick interpretations of Gods Word: And we will not believe any Point of our Faith (for example, the Trinity) upon that ground; because we know assuredly that our own Judgments, in our private interpretations of Scripture, are most fallible. Whence it is evident, that in those very Points in which we do agree, we Fundamentally disagree: Because we disagree in the very foundation of our belief concerning those Points. Now, in Point of belief, we must mainly attend, not only to the truth of what we believe; but to the ground upon which we build our belief. For, if we think our selves to build our belief securely, upon a foundation which is deceitful, (as our own interpretation is, and the Churches not :) we shall be soon lead to believe things which are false; as we see a World of People do, by relying on the Scripture as interpreted by their private Judgment. The Turk believes that there is a God, because his *Alcoran* (which is the Rule of his Faith) teacheth him so: Now, because he believes the truth upon a deceitful foundation; he, upon the same founda-

160 *The Bible not containing all points,*
foundation, builds the belief of a Thou-
sand falsities. Add to this, that this Judg-
ment of the Interpreter (who according
to you is every private Man, yea every
private Woman, for his or her own
self :) This Judgment, I say, is most weak
and many Points of Faith are matters ve-
ry hard to conceive, and unfold; and con-
troversies also are exceedingly intangled;
and the conferring Texts with Texts, like
and unlike, rather increaseth uncertainty
of hitting right, than it helps to any full
assured certainty: What then more sure,
than a most unassured proceeding, in this
interpreter? Again, private Judgments
being almost as various as private Faces
(yea often differing from themselves) infi-
nite variety of interpretations must needs
proceed from infinite private mens Judg-
ments, so very various. You may see
this in your Patriarch *Luther*; who, in
matters of highest moment, is noted no
less than *four score times* to have taught flat
contradictions: As you may see shewed in
the End of the first Tome of our Learned
Cocciius. Not only your *Martin Luther* thus
contradicted himself in words; but also
your *Martin Bucer* contradicted himself in
exterior change from Religion to Religi-
on: At one time *he fully judged* those Texts
of the Scripture, which speak of the
Sacrament of the Body of our Lord,
to

cannot be our Judge in all points. 161

to be truly interpreted by the *Roman Catholics*; and so he believed Christs Body to be really present, and to be adored in the Sacrament. After this, he judged most sincerely, that the *Lutherans* did truly interpret those Texts, and so he became a *Lutheran*, holding the real Presence, but denying Christs Body to be there Adored. Thirdly, After this, he most sincerely judged the Interpretation of those Texts, given by *Zuinglius*, to be the only true Sense of the Holy Ghost; and then he became a *Zuinglian*, denying Christs Body to be really present in the Sacrament, for which *Luther* termed him perfidious. Fourthly, He once more most sincerely judged *Luthers* Interpretation of those Texts to be the truer Sense of the Holy Ghost, and once more became a *Lutheran*: And therefore in his first Edition of his *Commentaries* upon the Sixth of *S. John* and Twenty sixth of *S. Matthew*, He asketh pardon of God and the Church, for having bewitched many with the Heresie of *Zuinglius*. Fifthly, Yet after this he sincerely Judged again *Zuinglius* his Interpretation of those Texts to be the only true one: And this Interpretation, he did publicly profess and defend at *Cambridge*; to which University, he was called out of *Germany*, as a prime Doctor, to help us here in *England*.

162 *The Bible not containing all points,*
land in our new begun Reformation.
And it is to be noted, That at every one
of these his Changes, he still used most
earnest protestations of undoubted certainty, con-
ceived from the Scriptures; as you may see
in the most Learned *Brecher*, in his *Treatise*
of *S. Austins Religion*, in the *Preface*, where
he cites his Authors for all these Changes.
To which, I add, that after all those
Changes, he is at last affirmed to have
died a Jew, by *Passevin in notis Verbi Dei*
and *Vlanbergius Causa 12.* And indeed,
for one who has first believed Scripture as
interpreted by every Mans private Judg-
ment, to be to every man the only ground
of all he is to believe concerning Christ,
and his Doctrin: And then has consider'd
after this, how groundless a ground this
is; and how, if this be the only means
left by Christ for Unity in his Church,
his Church is most pitifully provided:
For in this most highly important Point,
it cannot but breed a strong Temptation,
to fall quite out of love with Christ and
his Religion, in those who will not ad-
mit any thought of seeking for a better
Ground amongst us, where it might be
so easily found.

4. Questionless, if Christ be God, as
he is; and if he truly loves these Souls,
for which he died, he would not have
failed to provide them of some more as-
sured

cannot be our Judge in all points. 163.

ured means to know that true Faith, without which, he will not save them; than this means is, of leaving them to the Bible, as Interpreted by each one as he thinks rightest. What Law-maker in any Common-wealth, was ever yet found any where so imprudent, as only to leave the People of his Common-wealth so miserably provided (for the final ending all their Controversies) as they should be, if he did only leave them a Law-book for their sole and only Judge in all their Differences, without any living Judge to expound it with unappealable Authority. Well, now the Church of Christ is a Community, which was to be spread over the whole face of the Earth, and intended to last until the Consummation of the World: And therefore this Community, above all others, had the greatest need of a most super-abundantly-sufficient means to end all their Controversies, which do not concern their Temporal, but Eternal welfare. A World of Controversies must needs be still rising in a Community, concerning so many sorts of People, and those still further and further removed from Christs time, until the very end of the World. Wherefore this Community had been most miserably and pitifully provided for, in Point of Unity in Faith; and Christ should have

164 *The Bible not containing all points,*
have gather'd together a most Heart-dis-
united sort of People, if in all their num-
berless Differences, after all their read-
ing of Scriptures, conferring of Places,
and such like Rules as you prescribe;
they should have no other means left
them to end those Controversies, but the
written Text of the Bible, to be Ex-
pounded according as they can guess at
the intention of the Holy Ghost. True
Faith consists in the interior Judg-
ment; if then Christ desired, they should
be of one Faith, he desired also, they
should be of one interior Judgment:
But how could the Wisdom of God ex-
pect this Unity in the inward Judgment,
knowing so well, that every one of these
Judgments were so exceedingly different
in framing several Judgments, and that
even after they have used all the Rules
which you give them.

5. By this Discourse, without going
further, thou may'st once more see the
ungroundedness of all thy whole belief,
relying only upon the Word of God: As
this Word is expounded and understood
by thy Judgment, which in far easier
matters, has deceived thee a Thousand
times, and may do so in this hard mat-
ter, in which a World of better Under-
standings than thine, do vastly differ
from thee. If thou do Answer, that thou
relieft

cannot be our Judge in all points. 165

relieft not on thy Judgment, but on the Word of God. I ask, whether thou do'st relie on the Word of God, just as the Letter Sounds? Thou must say, no. How then? Thou must needs say, that thou do'st rely upon it, as it is Expounded by thy own Judgment. This also appears by the infinite contrariety of Expositions and Interpretations given by so many relying (just as thou dost) upon the Word of God; in so much, that there be no fewer than Two hundred several Interpretations of these four Words, *This is my Body*; which Interpretations, altho' they be not all allowed of by thy Religion, yet they all of them proceed from this very Ground of thy Religion, of taking the Word of God, not as it Sounds, nor as Expounded by the Church, but as every one in his private Judgment do's really think it ought to be Expounded. Wherefore, upon the whole matter, it is all one to rely upon a mans private Judgment, and to rely upon the Scripture, as Interpreted by his own private Judgment. See the vast variety of Religions, lately sprung up by following this Principle, in my first *Sett. N. 23*. If thou repliest that thou do'st not trust to, and rely upon thy Judgment, but upon the Spirit of God, which thou know'st assuredly to Rule this Judgment, securing

166 *The Bible not containing all points,*
securing it from all misunderstanding of
Gods Word; this thy Answer will have
many difficulties. First, How can'st thou,
without high presumption, assume to thy
private self, to secure an assistance of the
Spirit (assuredly preserving thee from all
Error, in thy private Judgment) when
thou do'st so pertinaciously deny, that the
Church representative it self (when it
judgeth in a General Council for the
whole World of Believers) is assured so
well in their publick Judgment, as thou
art in thy private? And yet, because thou
seest their Judgment quite contrary to
thee, thou must fall into this presump-
tuous Paradox. Secondly, How comes
there to be so mighty contrariety in Judg-
ments, among men confessedly guided
as surely by the Spirit, as thou art?
Thirdly, No one single Doctor of the
Primitive Church, did ever so much as
pretend to have this assurance of truth of
his Interpretation from the Spirit. Can'st
thou prudently believe thy self to have
a greater gift in this kind, than any one
of the Holiest Doctors of the Church
ever yet had? Fourthly, If thou beest
not a Prophet, and also, if all those of
thy Religion be not Prophets (which
was not in S. Pauls Church, as I
shewed in the last Sect. N. 3.) you
cannot possibly know, with any full
assurance,

cannot be our Judge in all points. 167

assurance, that the Holy Ghost do's assist you; because nothing, but the Word of God can secure you of this; and it is no where written in the Word of God, that you *A. B.* by your private Judgment, can infallibly expound all Texts in the Scripture concerning necessary Points. And if you, by your private Interpretation do expound any Text or Texts of Scripture so, as to secure you of this; yet you are assuredly to know, that you cannot assuredly know this Interpretation of those Texts to be most certainly true: For to know assuredly these Texts to be rightly expounded by you, you must be assur'd from some other Text, about the right understanding of which Text there will be still the same difficulty, and the same certain uncertainty; until, without bringing any Text, you can prove your self certainly to be thus Infallibly assisted in your Interpretation. And because you prove this without a Text, we are not to believe you, who teach us, that nothing is to be believ'd, as infallibly true, which is not written in the Bible: In all which I am sure, it is not written, that you *A. B.* are a true Believer; and therefore, tho' it were written there, *That all true Believers had this Assistance of the Spirit:* You were never the nearer.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, how preposterously ridiculous is it to hold your self Infallible in declaring Gods Word, and yet not to hold the whole Church Infallible in declaring or interpreting the same?

6. Wherefore, your last refuge is to say, that all Points necessary are clearly set down in Scripture; which I have shew'd (and shall further shew) to be manifestly false: And you may even with your Fingers touch the falshood of it, in this most necessary Point of knowing which is the certain undoubted true Sense of Scripture. For, in things which are clearly to be seen, there useth not to be variety (and infinite variety) of Judgments, as we have seen there is, in interpreting the necessary Texts of Scripture; insomuch, as no Divine by Scripture only, can convince an *Arian* *Cobler*, as I shew'd, *Seet. 1. N. 5.* Altho' this *Cobler* holds also Scripture for his only Judge. This variety of Interpretations (one flatly opposite to the other) shews evidently the Scripture in these Points not to be evidently clear. Again, if we mark it, this Answer is very little to the purpose in our Adversaries Principles: For *first*, they teach, that our Catholic Roman Religion do's not differ from theirs in any Point fundamental, or necessary to Salvation. Secondly, They

cannot be our Judge in all points. 169

They teach, that the Scripture cannot be shew'd to be clear in Points not so fully necessary for Salvation. Hence I argue thus, In Points wholly necessary to Salvation you and we all agree, as you say; so that by this you can infer no more, than, that the Scripture is clear in those Points in which we both agree. What get you by this? Do you separate from the whole Church for other Points, which you cannot prove your selves, by this ground, to have clear Scripture for? It is your common Doctrin deliver'd by Dr. *Fern*, in his *Seet. 13.* that *against public Authority* (especially of all Churches, in the whole World, all which you oppos'd in very many important Points) *there must be brought evident demonstrations of clear Scripture.* You do not prove, that you bring this, unless you can prove the Scripture Universally to be clear in Points not necessary to Salvation; for about these (as you say) we only differ. If you please to say then, tho' Scripture be not clear in all Points unnecessary, yet it is clear in those in which we now disagree; every Child will see, that you beg that very thing which is in question. And what Argument will you bring, to make us believe, that the best, and the choicest Doctors that were in any Church, for these last thousand and two or three hundred

; nsmo W I Years,

470 *The Bible not containing all points,*
Years, could not see the true sense of a
clear, plain, and evident Text of Scrip-
ture which they read every Day? And yet
you must encrease the Miracle, and say,
that all those Doctors of that Age in which
first the true Religion decay'd, must needs
know, that the whole former Church,
from Christs days to their days, had un-
derstood those clear places just as you un-
derstand them now; that is, in their true
Sense. Now, I pray, upon what Record
have you it related, that there did fall in
the Fourth, or Fifth, or Sixth Age, such a
thick Mist upon all the best seeing Eyes of
that unhappy Age, (about which Age al-
so none of you can agree,) that no one
Doctor could, or would see himself to
proceed against the known Sense of all
former Christianity, in the Interpretati-
on of those Texts, which so evidently
stand for the Doctrin of all former Chri-
stianity against them? Will you have us to
believe this strangest wonder of all won-
ders, without any Record from Antiqui-
ty, only upon your saying, that it was so?

7. There is yet another convincing
Reason, why this clearness you speak of
in Scriptures, to unfold unto us the un-
doubted Sense of the Holy Ghost in all
necessary Controversies, comes to be of
no service, for the infallible finding out
the true Sense by every privat Man and
Woman;

cannot be our Judge in all points. 171

Woman; to all which you use still to say, *If you will be with us, you shall see what you do; We require your Obedience to what we demonstrate to be Gods Will for you to believe and do, as Dr. Fern boasts, Sect. 14.* Here we come to the Point to see your demonstration; if you gull us here you undo us: Make us then see, that by clear demonstration of Scripture, we may see what God in all necessary Points requires of us to believe and to do; and make all of us, Men and Women, do this. How vastly you deceive us I have shew'd already, *Sect. 2. N. 13.* which place I must needs intreat the Reader to turn to, and read attentively, before he go's further. There we have shew'd (and that by Dr. Ferns own confession in his *Sect. 26.*) that all things necessary are not contain'd expressly in Scripture; but some of them are only thence deducible. But tell me (great Doctor) be they deducible by all of us, whom you promise so gloriously to make Eye-witnesses of this demonstration? *They be* (saith he) *deducible not all by every one that reads; but it is enough if done by the Pastors and Guides which God appointed in his Church to this purpose.* What? did you call us all to be blindfolded by you, and not to see the demonstration; but to hear only this news of it, that it has been seen to be

172 *The Bible not containing all points,*
 a demonstrable deduction by your Mi-
 nisters? We do not see your Demonstra-
 tion, but your gross Cheat. Yet (my
 dear Brother) thou shalt see thy self gul-
 led far more. Every Minister has not
 Eyes (how wilt thou know whether thy
 Minister has or no?) to see this Demon-
 strative Deduction; for Dr. Fern addeth,
That they must be Ministers using the means
that are needful (mark the word *needful*) *for*
that purpose, such as is, 1. *Attention.* 2. *Dili-*
gence in the search of the Scripture. 3. *Colla-*
tion of places. 4. *Observing the Connexions.*
 5. *Sincerity and Impartiality in the Col-*
lection or Deduction they make. 6. *Prayer and*
Devotion for assistance in the Work. Also, be-
 sides these six Rules, there be fourteen
 more to be added; as I shew'd in the place
 above cited; of which, some be as impos-
 sible for the vulgar multitude to use (tho'
 this multitude make up the number of
 the Believers) as it is for them to be cun-
 ning in Greek and Hebrew; for they (to
 know they have interpreted the Scrip-
 ture right) must of necessity be cunning
 in both these Languages. Neither do I
 say any more in this, than your own
 most Learn'd Doctors have said before
 me; to which I add your most Learn'd
Whitaker, Lib. de Sacra Script. P. 5. 23,
where he says of those who understand
not the Hebrew and Greek, That they
do

cannot be our Judge in all points. 173

do often err, and that unavoidably: *Sæpe ac
necessariò hallucinantur.* Now bid us poor
People Come with you, and we shall see what
we do. Now indeed we see what we do;
for we clearly see we do we know not
what; because we see we leave, by your
instruction, the interpretations of all
Councils, and Fathers, Seconded by the
the perpetual Practice of all Churches,
which God had upon the face of the
Earth, for twelve hundred years toge-
ther, as is confessed: and this we do, to
follow, not this evidence which we are
told we should see with our own eyes to
be such; but to follow what some Mi-
nisters say they see to be evident, to wit;
those few Ministers, who are perfectly
skill'd in Greek and Hebrew; of whose
perfect skill we have no knowledge of
our own; and tho' we had, we do not
perfectly know that they have used, in all
Points they teach us, these Twenty Rules
which they confess to be *Needful*: And
we also do know that all these Twenty
Rules are confessed to be fallible; and
we have little hope by Twenty fallible
means, to come to see an infallible truth
established; for when we were Boys at
School, Learning a little Arithmetick,
we were taught, that *naught times naught
did make nothing but naught.* *non est nihil
quod nichil faciat nisi nihil* *3* *of Mills*

*Mille licet Cypris Cyprarum millia jungas,
Nil præter Magnum conficiet Nihilum.
To Nothing joyn Ten thousand Nothings more:
Thou shalt find nothing but of Nothings store.*

Add not only Twenty, but Twenty Thousand fallible Rules: You shall be never the nearer that infallible truth, by being so well provided of Fallibilities.

8. I have (I hope) shew'd thee sufficiently, that thou canst not see assuredly, and upon thy own knowledge know evidently, which is the true Sense of the Scripture. Now I will give thee a further reason thereof, delivered by one of thy own chief Doctors, Doctor Jeremy Taylor in his discourse of the Liberty of Phrophecy-ing, Sect. 3. where he proves the uncertainty of Arguments deduced (as Dr. Fern speaks) from Scripture, by the many Senses of Scripture, when the Grammatical Sense is found out. For there is in very many Scriptures a double Sense, a Literal and a Spiritual; and both these Senses are subdivided: For the Literal Sense is either Natural, or Figurative; and the Spiritual sometimes Allegorical, sometimes Tropological; sometimes there are Divers Literal Senses in the same Places: So he. Now it depends upon the secret intention of the Holy Ghost, to have us'd these Words in some one,

cannot be our Judge in all points. 275

one, or two, or more of these Senses. How shall we find out so great a secret, and that so infallibly, as to be undoubtedly assured, of our own knowledge, that we have certainly discover'd this secret? Twenty fallible Rules, tho' we should use them all, as well as a man could, would not bring us to this infallible assurance. Even your great Doctors (who have used them better than thou canst hope to do) have had Two hundred several Opinions about the true Sense of these four Words, *This is my Body*. Thou thinkest thy self to be assured infallibly, upon thy own knowledge, that these Words be to be interpreted figuratively; because thou hast conferred this Text with some other Texts, for Example with those Texts which tell thee that *Christ's Words be Spirit and Life*, and that *The flesh profiteth nothing*. Alas thou hast observed but one of these Twenty Rules, which is, Conference of one Text with another. This Rule is infinitely deceitful, as the same Doctor Taylor teacheth thee, who in his next Section saith; *Another great pretence (to justify new Interpretations) is the conference of Places; A thing of such indefinite capacity, that, if there be ambiguity of words, variety of Senses, alteration of Circumstances, or difference of stile amongst Divine Writers, there is nothing which may be more abused by*

176 *The Bible not containing all points,*
wilful people, or may more easily deceive the
unwary, or that may amuse the most intelligent
observers. What shall then become of
thee and me who are none of the most
intelligent observers? And so this Rule
alone leaves us at a *non plus*, even though
we had both Greek and Hebrew: For (as
the same Doctor intimates) it is a most pi-
tiful Argument to infer; *this must infalli-*
bly be the true Sense, because I can shew
that *perhaps it may be the true Sense*. Again,
when your Doctors bid me confer this
Text with other Texts of the Bible: I
ask, whether I must confer it only with
other places of the same Book in which
it is Written? They will say, no; but
I must confer it with all other Texts of
the Word of God, Written in any Book.
First this is a vast labor, and requires a
vast memory to do it, as it should be
done, with exquisite attention. *Secondly*,
I have a question to ask, which I am
sure will pose you, how shall I, or any
Doctor of them all, confer this Text
with the Texts of all other Books of Scrip-
ture, seeing that no fewer than some
Twenty Books of Scripture have quite
perished, and be no where to be found
in the whole World? As I shew'd *Seet.*
I. N. 7. *Thirdly*, you say that by this
conferring of Places, what was obscure
proves clear: And you mark not, that by
the

cannot be our Judge in all points. 177

the very same means, what was clear grows obscure. What more clear than what St. Paul said; *If you be Circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing. Gal. 5.* Take this so clear a Text, and confer it with that *Act. 16. 3. He took Timothy, and Circumcised him;* and you will find difficulty how the former Text can stand in full force. Do you think St. Paul would make *Christ* profit *Timothy* nothing?

9. Hence I infer, that if God had intended the Scripture for our sole and only Rule of Faith, he would have set down in some one place all necessary Points clearly, and distinctly; and he would not have left these Points to be picked out, one out of one Book, another out of another, no man directly knows where: Yea, no man knows by Scripture, which Points are necessary even for himself or for all. Had God intended to make a Book our only Judge or Rule, he would have given us such a Book, as should clearly and distinctly have said; *These Points are necessary to be believed, these things are necessary to be done.* But now, one man tells us one thing is necessary, another man says no: The Scripture says neither Yea nor No. Therefore, to those who will follow Scripture only, no assurance at all can be had of the necessity of such Points as the Scripture

178 *The Bible not containing all points,*
do's not affirm to be necessary: For if
you have only Human reason for this ne-
cessity, this is but a Human motive,
which is deceitful; and being thwarted
with a contrary reason of as apparent
probability, my Faith now is turned in-
to a doubt. The Points which are ne-
cessary, you commonly say to be but
few; and that the Scripture sets them
down clearly, as it do's also set down clear-
ly many other Points not necessary.
Whence the vast number of those not-
necessary Points clearly set down doth
infinitely increase the difficulty of finding
out these few which are necessary: Seeing
that they lye so scatter'd and intermingled
in the numberless number of the not-ne-
cessary. For some of these necessary Points
are set down here, in the begining of the
Bible; some one, some two or three Books
after; some other hard by that, some o-
ther a huge way off; and so from *Gen.* to
the *Apoc.* Yea, why not further than the
Apoc. for it is a meer guess made at ran-
dom, to conjecture that in those Twenty
Books of Scripture, which be quite lost,
no one necessary Point should be set down
plainly, which is not set down plainly in
these Books which we have. At least you
say this without Scripture; and therefore
by your own Principles, you should not
say it: For your part being affirmative,
(affirming

cannot be our Judge in all points. 179

(affirming that no one, necessary Point was plainly set down in those Books which be lost, which is not plainly set down in these which we have;) you must prove what you say, and that by Scripture: For I am sure you cannot prove it by Tradition; and therefore neither in your, nor our Principles, it can be proved. Again; the Bible, as it is now, makes a Book so big, that the far greater part of the World, taken up with so many necessary affairs, cannot in a very long space of time read over this Book so often, and so exactly carry away all the clear Texts thereof, as to be able to confer one place with another: For before they come to the other, which is perhaps in the *Apocalypse*, that Text, which they did read in *Genesis*, is out of their mind: Or if that Text be not, some other may be, even at a time in which they should have most observed it. Besides this, what am I the nearer if I spend all this labor in my English Translated Bible; of the right Translation of which I neither have, nor can have full assurance, if I be not a very great Scholar; as has been shew'd *Secl. 5*. Yea, tho' I be so great that one among one Hundred Thousand is not greater; (for I understand Greek and Hebrew most skilfully :) Yet, for all this, I neither have, nor can have full assurance, that the

189 *The Bible not containing all points,*
the Greek and Hebrew Copies which I
use, be the true Copies of the true Word
of God; as has been shew'd *Section 5.*
God's Wisdom directs him to the best
means, to compass his intention: We
even in our ordinary Wisdom, if we in-
tend to set forth a Book, which should
end all necessary Controversies, would
all do our best endeavor to comprise in
half a dozen Chapters at the most, all
these few Fundamental Points; for these
Points you teach to be but few: And we
would not make those poor Souls (which
we dearly loved) at the peril of their own
Damnation, to seek out, all the whole
Bible over, these few Points which are
confessed not to be so easy to be found out,
but by some choice Ministers observing
all that long way, which is from the first
of *Genesis* to the very last *Verse* of the *Apo-*
calypt, no fewer than Twenty Rules, and
many of them very hard ones to observe
at all times, in all passages of so long a
journey. And yet there is, to the full, as
great reason, why those Twenty Books
more, which are lost, as all these which
we now have, should be consulted: Be-
ing God gave us all the whole written
Word for our Guide. God did not pro-
ceed thus even in the Old Law in Points
of far, and incomparable far less con-
cernment; to wit in Points of meer
Ceremony:

cannot be our Judge in all points. 181

Ceremony: For every little particular Ceremony which he exacted, is with most minute exactness set down in the compals of not many Leafs: Yet far fewer would contain all Points necessary to Salvation, if they be so few as you hold.

10. We then, by our own Judgment, are not able to deduce demonstratively all those Truths and Verities which are wholly necessary to our Salvation: But instead of doing this by our own selves, and upon our own knowledge, with demonstrative security; we are in plain terms, told by the best Protestant Doctors, that this cannot be done by us, even in all these necessary Points; no, nor done by all our Ministers, without the use of many Rules, which the far greater part of them cannot use. What then shall we do? Which way shall we turn our selves? Is there no better way, than to trust those choice, but still Fallible Ministers, using still only Fallible Rules, and infallibly sure to contradict one another? I will tell thee first, what thy own Protestant Prime Masters in Scripture do plainly tell thee, I mean, those Renowned Doctors, who now, at this very time, are setting forth that so famous Bible, of so many Learn'd Languages. These Doctors, perusing Night and Day, the best Original Copies
of

182 *The Bible not containing all points;*
of the Bible that be to be had, may as
safely be followed by thee, as any Mini-
sters thou knowest. These Men in the
Preface to their great Work which I ci-
ted, *Sect. 4. N. 8.* having first endea-
vour'd to clear that Controversie about
the truth of the Copies of Gods true
Word which they give us; they then
speak thus, *The whole Controversie being a-*
bout the true Sense of the Scripture, deliver'd
by Translations every where receiv'd, we have
ready at hand the Judgment almost of that
whole Church which is Catholic (or Univer-
sal) as well in respect of its being in all places,
as its being in all times; which Church unfold-
eth to us the places in Controversie. To whose
Judgment (mark this) he who will not sub-
mit himself, truly he sheweth himself to be a
Man of no Judgment, and he is scarce worth
the name of a Man, much less of a Christian.
So they, *fol. 4.* This is a different Lesson
from what Dr. Fern taught thee. But it
has better Authority, Catholic Antiquity
being altogether of one mind in this Point.
I will tell thee this out of a most appro-
ved Doctor of the Primitive Church,
and no Man do's so much as question
whether the words which I shall cite
out of him be his or no; he ha's but one
little Book in all: It is *Vincentius Lirinensis*,
who lived in the Fifth Age; he writes
thus, *Do Heretics use the Testimonies of*
Scripture?

cannot be our Judge in all points. 183

Scripture? Yes indeed, do they, and that most
vehemently; you shall see them fly through
all the Sacred Books, the Books of Moses, the
Books of Kings, the Psalms, the Apostles,
the Gospels, the Prophets: And this whe-
ther they be among their own People, or others;
both privately or publicly; both in their Dis-
courses and in their Books; both in Banquets,
and in the Streets; they scarce ever speak one
word of their own which they do not set forth
with the words of the Scripture. Read but the
Works of Paulus Samosatenus, of Prisci-
lianus, Eunomius, Jovinianus, and such
like pestiferous fellows, you shall see infinite
heaps of Examples, and scarce one side of a
Leaf, which is not painted out with Sentences
of the New and Old Testament. And a little
after, when now they shall begin, not only to
bring forth, but also to expound, and not only to
cast out, but also to intrepert those words, then
prophane Novelties are laid open, then you
may see the Hedges cut down, and those limits
transferr'd which our Fathers did put us; then
you may see the Doctrin of the Church torn in
pieces, &c. And by and by, But some one
will say, what shall Catholics do, and the Sons
of the Church? By what means shall they di-
stinguish the truth contain'd in Scriptures from
the falsity of their Interpretations; They must
exceedingly apply their care to interpret the
Divine Canon of Scripture, according to the
Traditions of the Universal Church, and
the

184 *The Bible not containing all points,
the Rules of the Catholic Doctrin; which
practice I said in the beginning of this Book
was deliver'd down unto us by Holy and
Learned Men. So he. And the place
which he cited out of the beginning of
his Book, is admirable to our present
Discourse; for having put the very Ob-
jection which our Adversaries use to
make; That seeing the Canon of the Scrip-
ture is perfect, and superabundantly sufficient
in all respects; what need is there that the Au-
thority of the Churches Interpretation should be
join'd to it? Then he answers; Because for-
sooth all Men do not in one and the self same
sense take the Sacred Scripture by reason of the
great depth thereof. One Man expounds it one
way, one Man another way; insomuch, that
as many Senses may seem to be deducible from
it, as there be Men. For Novatianus ex-
pounds it one way, Photinus another, Do-
natus another, Arius, Eunomius, Mace-
donius another; Apollinaris and Priscillia-
nus, Jovinianus and Pelagius another;
Lastly, Celestius and Nestorius another.
And therefore, multum necesse est, It is ve-
ry much necessary to avoid so great and so ma-
nifold Labyrinths of Error, that the Line, by
which we rule out the Interpretation of the
Prophets and Apostles, be directed according
to the Rules of the Church and the Catholic
sense. So he; so I; say thou also so; and
all our Divisions will be ended; for then
we*

cannot be our Judge in all points. 185

we should not, under pretence of seeing with our own Eyes what we do, take the Scripture contrary to so many Councils, and all Authority of Church-Tradition; because we judge it ought to be expounded so in our private Judgment, tho' differing from all Churches upon the Face of the Earth. But I must have a Church, upon whose Authority we all securely may and also must rely, in interpreting the Scriptures, as *St. Vincent* speaks; and that Church must of necessity be granted to be Infallible; but no Church can be Infallible which has not this condition, that it holds and teacheth it self to be Infallible; as I shall demonstrate, *Sect. 17. N. 2.* which condition agreeing to no one Church but the *Roman* (as is manifest,) this Holy Father, and all the rest (who bid us still in Doubts and Controversies about the Scriptures, and their several Interpretations rely upon the Church, and take her Doctrine for our warrant) do bid us rely upon that Church which was held and truly held by all to be Infallible. And so all very well know, that they meant the *Roman* Church, and no Church differing in Communion from her; because this condition agreed to none but Her. When this was so undisputably out of all question, among all such as were then counted Catholics, then they thought

286 *The Bible not containing all points,*
thought it enough to say, *Rely on the*
Church; without saying, *Rely on the*
Roman Church. So we Catholics, speak
to this very Day, never adding the
Roman, but for our Adversaries sake a-
mong whom we live; just as English-men
say, *The Parliament decided such a thing*;
meaning the *Parliament of England*;
which all English in *England* perfectly un-
derstand without adding any other
words: But the English (who live among
French-men) when in *France* they say, *The*
Parliament decrees such a thing; they must of
necessity add, *the Parliament of England*, to
be rightly understood of the French-men
there; who otherwise might think they
meant some French Parliaments. Those
who have made themselves of a different
Communion from *Rome*, will not now
in these days understand that pure old
Catholic Language still common to all us
of the *Roman Communion*: *The Church*
Decreed this; *Follow the Interpretation of*
the Church; *rely on the Interpretation of the*
Church, &c. when we express our selves
thus by this word *Church*, without ad-
ding the word *Roman*, we are known
by all who be of the true Church, on-
ly to mean the *Roman Church*, and those
of her Communion: Yet even we in these
strange new times to be understood by
these

cannot be our Judge in all points. 187

these outlandish (as I may say) and new-found people of our days, must needs add the word *Roman*; or else they will not understand us to speak of that Church, of which we are by all our own Church most perfectly understood to speak. And Antiquity by the name of *the Church*, still meant the *Roman Church*, just as we do; and just as we speak among our selves, so then spoke the holy grave Fathers, whose Catholic Language was nothing understood by that Foreigner, who, more boldly than advisedly, said, that none of the Ancient Christians believed the Church of Rome to be a Guide or Judge of all Controversies in Christianity, because Tertullian, Vincentius Lirinensis and others giving Rules to know Heretics, forgot this main and clearest Rule: Whereas you see by the words I have cited that Vincentius Lirinensis tells you as clearly as I do, that to avoid Heresie you must, in understanding the Scripture, follow the Interpretation of the Church, as a secure Guide and Interpreter in all Controversies arising about the sense of Scriptures, shewing it a note of Heresie to do the contrary. The very self same is told you by all those Fathers whom I shall cite Sect. 21. Numb. 2, 3, 4. There is then no more mystery in saying that those Ancient Fathers, being Members of the Roman Church, did by the name of the Church mean

188 *The Bible not containing all points,*
mean that *Roman Church*, of which they
were Members, tho' they added not the
Name of *Roman*; then there is in the or-
dinary speech of every Man in *England*,
when, by the name of *the Parliament*, he
means only to signifie the *English Parlia-*
ment; tho' he adds not the word *English*;
and yet that acute *University-Man* will
not understand this so vulgar Language.

Sect. 8.
A Twelfth Argument. Divers other neces-
sary Points not contained in, or decided by
Scripture.

I. **T**O the former Nineteen Points all
necessary, and none of them all
contained in Scripture, I will add divers
more. The Creed of St. *Athanasius* has
ever been admitted by all succeeding true
believers, and your *English Church* do's
profess to believe it, and used to read it
in their Common-Prayer. In this Creed
you profess your selves to believe several
Points no where contain'd in the Bible in
plain terms: *As that God the Father is not*
begotten; that God the Son is not made, but be-
gotten by his Father only; that the Holy Ghost
is neither made nor begotten, but do's proceed,
and that from the Father and the Son; And
that, he who will be saved, must believe this

For

cannot be our Judge in all points. 189

For this is an Article of that Catholic Faith, *which Faith without a man holds entirely and inviolably, without all doubt he shall perish Eternally.* All this is in that Creed professed by us; and yet not one of those several Points contain'd in it, can be shewed to be contain'd in Scripture, no not for the Substance of them in any such Texts as clearly decide the matter. Note by the way, how you plainly contradict your selves, who subscribe to the truth of all that has been said of the necessity that there is to Salvation, to believe all the foresaid particulars here expressed by St. Athanasius: And yet you will needs hold the Greek Church for a true Church, which holds flatly against St. Athanasius in this Article, tho' *the holding of it entirely be necessary to Salvation.*

2. To this Point (for I let all these several Points pass for only one) I might add, that in the same Book of Common-Prayer you in another Creed believe, that *Christ is of one substance with the Father,* and that *the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son:* For which words the Grecian Church holds us all Hereticks; and yet your Doctors of the English Church will needs hold them a true Church. But that which I press is, that we are bound to give an infallible assent to this Article of God *the Son's being of one*

Sub-

144 *The Bible not containing all points, Substance with the Father: But you, who will give no infallible assent to any thing but Gods written word, cannot possibly give infallible assent to this Article, which is no where clearly set down in Scripture, but an Arian Cobler will easily put off all the Texts you can bring; as I shewed S. 1. N. 5. But not to stand contesting about the clearness of these Texts, let this Point pass joyned to the former.*

3. For another Point not contained in Scripture, I bring the *Baptism of Children*, which is wholly necessary to the Salvation of Children. The Learned *Layman* says L. 5. Tra. 2. C. 6. nu. 11. that it has been by some observed that *the third part of Mankind dyed before the seventh year of their Age be ended.* The third part then of Mankind is concerned in this one Point, of giving Lawful Baptism to them when they are Children; and yet, a Point so necessary to the Salvation of many, is no where plainly set down in Scripture. To this Dr. *Fern* answers, S. 24. *Baptism of Children, as to the practice of it, is not contained expressly in Scripture; (id est) it is no where Commanded to be done, or said that they did do it: But the ground and necessity of it are sufficiently deliver'd in Scripture; and that is enough for the doing of it. And that the Arguments from Scripture, by Bellarmine and others*

cannot be our Judge in all points. 198
others alledged, do sufficiently shew. Fur-
thermore concerning Bellarmine, the Do-
ctor tells us, that he (*Lik. de Baptismo*
c. 8.) saith, That the Arguments for Chil-
drens Baptism out of Scripture cannot be a-
voided; and that it is a thing evident in Scrip-
ture. But yet saith (Dr. Fern) when he
treats of Traditions (*L. 4. de Verbo Dei*,
Cap. 4.) This thing of Childrens Baptism must
be one of them, that is necessary and not con-
tain'd in Scripture. This is not ingenuous nor
conscionable. So Dr. Fern, but far less
conscionably: For Bellarmine, *L. 7. de*
Bapt. in all that Eighth Chapter has no
word in favor of the Evidence of Scrip-
ture for Baptism of Children: Yea, al-
most at every Text that he cites, he
shews, that Text to have no force out of
our Adversaries Mouth. Of one Argu-
ment out of Scripture, he says indeed,
that, as it cometh from us, (which words
Dr. Fern conceals) it is so manifest that it
cannot be avoided; and that is, that Cir-
cumcision was so clear a Figure of Bap-
tism, that St. Paul called it Circumcision:
But Circumcision was given to Infants,
therefore Baptism may. But here Bellar-
mine may well mean, that this Argu-
ment, as it comes from us, cannot be
eluded; to wit, by that usual shift, by
which the Anabaptists can easily elude it
when it comes from Lutherans and Cal-
vinists.

192 *The Bible not containing all points,*
conists; whom *Bellarmin* had shew'd to
teach, that the form of Baptism was on-
ly a Sermon, which agrees not to In-
fants: This evasion cannot any way elude
this Argument as it comes from us. This
is all can be convinc'd out of this place
of *Bellarmin*. But there be other solid
ways of avoiding all force of this Argu-
ment, even as it comes from us. For first,
every Sacrament must not be receiv'd by
all those, by whom the Figure of that Sa-
crament might lawfully be taken; Sin-
ners did lawfully eat Manna, but they
cannot lawfully receive the Eucharist;
of which Manna was a Figure: So also
Circumcision was necessary for the Male-
children of the *Jews* only, and that not
before the Eighth Day; and Baptism is
now necessary both for the Male and Fe-
male Children of all Nations in the
World, and that before either the Eighth,
or Second Day, if there be danger of
Death: The Consequence then holds not
from the Figure to the thing figured. Nei-
ther is that a necessary Consequence
which is drawn from Baptising of whole
Families. For first, as we read, that
whole Families were Baptiz'd, so we read
that whole Families believ'd. *Himself be-*
liev'd and his whole Family, Jo. 4. v. 53.
Will you evidently infer from hence,
that the little Children, not yet of years
of

cannot be our Judge in all points. 193

of discretion, did believe? They then only believ'd who were capable: So will *Anabaptists* say, they only were Baptiz'd in these Families, who were capable of first believing, and answering for themselves. Secondly, In many Families all the Children which are alive, are above seven Years old, and of Age to believe: There be many Families of new married People, who, as yet have no Children; or those they had be dead: Many are barren, and will never have any. Now Mr. *Doctor*, as these two chief places (brought by *Bellarmin*, or others) do afford you no clear Principle, from which you can evidently deduce the necessity of Infants Baptism, or that it is good and valid, and not to be iterated; or that their Parents are oblig'd to procure it for their little Children; so other less strong places will less help you to the evident inference of any of these Points, which you hold necessarily to be believ'd. I am not satisfied by being told other Men cite Texts which do prove this evidently: You must cite them, and shew them to be evident. The best Text, besides these, is this, *Except a Man be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, Jo. 3. 5.* but how many shifts the *Anabaptists* have, to avoid the force of this Text *Bellarmin*

K

tells

194 *The Bible not containing all points,*
tells you; and you shall see one presently.

4. Much more Ingenuous and Conscionable is your Dr. Taylor in his Defence of Episcopacy, S. 9. P. 100, where he saith, *Baptism of Infants is of ordinary necessity to all that ever cry'd; and yet the Church has founded this Rite upon the Tradition of the Apostles. And wise Men do easily observe, that the Anabaptists can, by the same probability of Scripture enforce a necessity of Communicating Infants upon us, as we do of baptising, upon them. For as we press them with that Text, Except a Man be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven: So they press us for the necessity of Infants Communion, by the Text which follows but three Chapters after the former: Verily verily I say unto you, except you eat of the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you have no life in you. Dr. Taylor adds, And therefore a great Master of Geneva, in a Book he writ against the Anabaptists, was forc'd to fly to Apostolical, Traditive Ordination. Here is the very thing ingenuously confess'd which we labor to prove; that we must trust the Churches Tradition for this Point; the necessity of which is so great, that he adds, They that deny this, are by the just Anathema of the Catholic Church, confidently condemn'd for Heretics. The Pelagians were ever accounted Heretics, even*
in

cannot be our Judge in all points. 195

in this respect, that they (as *St. Austin* witnesseth, *Heres. 88.*) taught, *Altho' Infants be not Baptiz'd, they shall possess an eternal and blessed life; tho' it be out of the Kingdom of God.* Those Protestants are far bolder, who admit them even into the Kingdom of Heaven it self. The Doctrin of the Ancient Fathers is so manifestly against this Doctrin, that *Calvin* himself says, (*Instit. Lib. 4. C. 15. N. 20.*) *It was usual many Ages since, even almost from the beginning of the Church, that in danger of death, Lay-People might Baptize.* So he. And to say the contrary, were to cross all Antiquity; as your *Bilson* confesseth in his Conference at *Hampton-Court.* *Hooker* saith no less in his fifth Book of *Eccl. Policy* 62. For, as your *Musculus* confesseth, *The Fathers deny'd Salvation to the Children who died without Baptism, tho' their Parents were faithfull.* So he, in *Locis tit. de Baptismo.*

5. To these I might add the *Milevetan* Council, in which *St. Austin* was present and Subscrib'd, and in which (*Can. 2.*) it is defin'd, *That whosoever denies Children newly born to be baptiz'd, or say, they contract nothing of Sin from Adam, which may be cleansed by the Laver of Regeneration: Anathema.* But that which I chiefly insist on, is, that the Fathers profess to believe the necessity of Baptism for Infants upon Tradition. So that here *Dr. Fern* will see a Point necessary to Salvation to come

196 *The Bible not containing all points,*
down to us by unwritten Tradition;
which he stily denies, *Sect. 24. Origen,*
who liv'd just upon the Second Age
(which Age knew best the Tradition of the
First Age) writes thus, *Cap. 6. Epistola ad*
Romanos. The Church from the Apostles has
receiv'd the Tradition to give Baptism even to
little ones. And the great *St. Austin* is wit-
ness of the Continuance of this Tradition
in his Age; as also, that this Point ought
not to be believ'd at all, but upon Tradit-
tion: (Note his words, *Mr. Doctor,* they
be these,) *The custom of our Mother, the*
Church, in baptising little ones, is not to be
contemned: Neither is it by any means to be
reputed superfluous: Neither ought it to be be-
liev'd at all, without it were an Apostolical
Tradition, Lib. 10. de Gen. ad lit. C. 22.
Note that he esteems the belief of this ne-
cessity to be so weakly grounded in Scrip-
ture, that it ought not at all to be believ'd with-
out it came down to us by Tradition. And again
(*contra Crescon. Lib. 1. C. 33.*) speaking of
this Point, he saith, *That nothing for cer-*
tain can be alledg'd out of Canonical Scriptures
in this Point: Yet in this Point, the truth of
Scriptures (and consequently a sufficient
ground for Faith) is kept by us, when we
do that which seem'd good to the Catholic
Church; which Church the Authority of the
same Scriptures do's commend. Now joyn
this place to these places which I
have

cannot be our Judge in all points. 197

have alledg'd in the last *Seet. N. 1.* to shew that the Scripture did bid us still follow the Church; and you will see manifestly that we may, and, in this Point, must ground our Faith upon what we have only from the Church; or else we can have no Faith at all of this necessity of Baptism, as our Adversaries have none at all of it: For Scripture they have not, and the Tradition of the Church they hold no sufficient ground of Faith; which *St. Austin* in this necessary Point takes for the chief ground of his Faith: And again (*Lib. 4. C. 24. adversus Donat. de Baptism. Parvulorum*) speaking of this Point, *That which the Universal Church holds, and was not instituted by Councils, but yet always held, is most rightly believ'd to be deliver'd down to us by no other than Apostolical Authority.* If Apostolical Authority be not a sure ground for belief, upon what ground have we receiv'd all our Writings as Divine? This Authority secur'd *St. Austin* in the belief of a necessary Point not contain'd in Scripture. The like Authority may also as well secure us all in those other necessary Points, which we have shew'd to be contain'd in no Scripture.

6. What I have said will be much confirm'd by another necessary Point, which also is not contain'd in any

K 3 Scripture.

198 *The Bible not containing all points,*
Scripture. It is a damnable Heresie to affirm, That those who are Baptiz'd by Heretics, ought to be Baptiz'd again. This Controversie was mov'd in the days of St. Cyprian; and he was a Man as able to see that which was clearly set down in Scripture, as any of you all: Yet, as appears by his First Book of Epistles (Ep. 6.) and other places, he did really judge the Scripture to teach, that all those were to be Rebaptiz'd, who had been Baptiz'd by Heretics. On this ground he held that Opinion. And for the same Opinion, saith *Vincentius Lirinensis*, there stood so great force of Wit, such torrents of Eloquence, so great a number of Patrons, so great appearance of Truth, so many Oracles of Scripture, tho' misinterpreted. How come they to be overthrown? He tells you a little before, *Then Pope Stephen of blessed Memory, the Bishop of the Apostolic See, together with his fellow Bishops, yet more than any other, did resist them; esteeming it, as I think, a worthy thing, if he did surpass all the rest in Devotion of Faith, as he surpass'd them in the Authority of his place. In fine, in that Epistle of his, which was sent into Africa, he decreed with these words: That nothing ought to be innovated; but that to be retain'd which was deliver'd down to us. Hence, saith this Holy Father, the end of the business was, that, Antiquity kept possession.*
And

cannot be our Judge in all points. 199.
And he adds, *Strange change of things. The*
Authors of the self same Opinion are judged
Catholics, and their followers Heretics. The
Masters of it are absolved, and the Disciples
condemned. So he: For it was not a ne-
cessary Point of belief, before the Church
had declared this Opinion to be con-
trary to true Faith, because it was
contrary to Tradition; now in a Coun-
cil examin'd by the Church, and found
to be full and strong enough to assure us
of the Apostles Authority in this Point.
And so St. Cyprian and others did hold
the contrary Opinion, and were not He-
retics: But all those who, after this
Declaration, opposed this Tradition thus
examin'd, and proved for *Apostolical*, were,
for that very opposition of such a Tra-
dition adjudged Heretics. Neither were
they before adjudged to be Heretics for
their opposing the Scripture as clear in
that Point. No such thing was ever so
much as objected against them. Hence
that great *African Doctor St. Austin*, speak-
ing of this very Point of Rebaptization,
Writes thus, *De Unitate Eccl. c. 22. This*
is neither openly nor evidently read (in Scrip-
ture) either by you or by me: Yet if there were
any wise man, of whom our Saviour had given
Testimony, and that he should be consulted in
this question; we should make no doubt (Mark
this all you who oppose the Infallibility

200. *The Bible not containing all points,*
of the Church, to perform what he should
say; lest we should seem not so much to gain-
say him, as to gainsay Christ, by whose Testi-
mony he was recommended. Now Christ
bears witness to his Church. Mark also
this reason, and confer it with all those
Testimonies given by Scripture to the
Church which I cited the last Sect. N. 1.
and then mark St. Austins Consequence,
which is, *Whosoever refuseth to follow the*
practice of the Church, do's resist our Saviour
himself who by his Testimony commends the
Church. Go now, and tell St. Austin
that seeing neither he nor you could find
this Point in Scripture, therefore it is
not necessary to hold with the Church in
this Point, for which she hath only Tra-
dition: You shall see if he will not again
tell you, as clearly as I do, that as you
should oppose Christ himself, if you
refused to obey some one man, whom
Christ should bid you obey in Points of
belief; *And you should not so much disobey*
the man, as you should disobey Christ. *Autho-*
rizing this Man; so being that Christ bids
you obey the Church, you should not
so much disobey the Church, in refusing
to obey her in Points of Faith, as you
should disobey Christ who Authorized
the Church, and invested her with this
power in the Texts cited Sect. 7. N. 1.

7. Here

cannot be our Judge in all points. 201

7. Here again St. Austin de Baptismo contra Donatistas, Lib. 15. C. 23. The Apostles (in Scripture) have prescribed nothing concerning this thing; (the Point I speak of) but this custom, which was opposite to St. Cyprian, ought to be believed to have taken its origin from their Tradition. As there are many things (note that he speaks in a matter necessary to be believed) which the Universal Church observes; and for that reason (O excellent Reason) are rightly believed to have been commanded by the Apostles, altho' they are not found in their Writings. Give me leave here to ask; whether it be not Damnable, to refuse the observation of that which, upon so good a Reason, (as is the Testimony of the Universal Church,) is rightly believed to have been commanded by the Apostles? Sure I am that you cannot have the Thousand part of so good a Testimony, that such an one is your Father; no, nor that such an one is your Mother: And yet it is Damnable to refuse to obey them. Tell me then, tell me; I say, tell me, why should it not be much more Damnable, to refuse Obedience in a Point (for Example, the Fast of Lent) which the Universal Church testifies, that it is rightly believ'd to have been commanded by the Apostles? Whence Mr. Cartwright in his Second Reply against Whitg. par. 1. Saith.

202 *The Bible not containing all points,*
If St. Austins Judgment be a good Judgment,
then there be some things commanded of God,
which are not in the Scriptures. Whitakers
and Reynolds Words speak much to that
effect. See also St. Austin Lib. 2. contra
Donat. C. 7. and my Sect. 21. N. 5.

8. Here I might shew, out of most evident Texts of Holy Fathers, that the Apostles did make the Fast of *Lent* a matter of Precept; and consequently the breach of it to be Damnable, and the observance of it necessary to Salvation. See *St. Leo Sermon. 6. Sermon. 9. St. Ambrose Sermon. 25. Sermon. 34. Sermon. 36. St. Hier. Epistle. 54. St. Austin fully Sermon. 62.* And see him presently against *Aerius*. Also that those are judged Heretics by the Church, and called *Quarta-decimani*, who would needs observe *Easter* on the fourteenth of the Moon, tho' it were not Sunday: Yet no clear Scripture was against them; but they were against the Church. So for the same Reason *Aerius* is listed for an Heretic; and one of his Heresies is related by *St. Austin* (in his Book of Heresie, Heresie 53.) to be this: *He taught private Opinions of his own, saying; That we must not Pray or Offer for the Dead; and that the solemnly approved Fasts were not to be kept; that every man was to fast when he pleased; that he might not seem to be under the Law.* Were not these Heresies good Protestant Doctrin?

cannot be our Judge in all points. 203

Doctrin? So is that which follows; *If at all I will fast; I will choose any day of my self; and I will fast that day to shew my Liberty;* Saith the same Heretic in St. Epiphanius his Catalogue. *Her. 72.* I might also add, that St. Austin, in the same Book (*Her. 84.*) put down for Heretics, the *Helvidians*, for affirming that the *Virgin Mary* had other Children after the Birth of our Saviour: And there is no clear Text of Scripture against them. Yea St. Jerom sweats hard to answer all the Texts of Scripture which *Helvidius* brought: See his Book against that Heretic: Whose Heretical followers St. Epiphanius in his Catalogue calls *Antidicomaritas*. I might also add several such Points; *as to communicate fasting; and but once in the day:* And such like Points wholly necessary for our observance; and whose transgression is Damnable; Yet, to be liberal, I will take all these last Points specified in this Number, only for one. Now, for the Peoples sake, who are most capable of that Point, I will add one more in a Section apart; and so will make the former Nineteen Points to be just two Dozen, by the addition of these four Points explicated in this Section, and of that other Point which follows. I shall add also another *Sect. 16. N. 2.* And yet another *Sect. 20. N. 4.* And yet another *Sect. 21. N. 5.*

Sect.

Sect. 9.

A Thirteenth Argument. A four and Twentieth necessary Point not contained in Scripture.

1. **A**Ll things, say you, which are necessary either to be believed or done, for obtaining Salvation, are clearly put down in Scripture: I now, by a four and Twentieth instance, shew this to be false. That is necessarily to be done to Salvation, which left undone causeth Damnation; But the observation of the Sunday, (commanding the abstaining from all servile works) if neglected, or left undone, brings Damnation; therefore to observe in this manner the Sunday, is a thing necessary to Salvation. And yet this Point is so far from being clearly put down in Scripture, that, standing meerly to the sole Judgment of Scripture, we can shew far clearer Texts for still observing the *Saturday*, than for the Lawfulness of working upon that day, and the unlawfulness of working upon the Sunday: For neither of these have so much as one clear Text; but the still keeping of the *Saturday* (for all those who hold Scripture the only Rule of Faith and necessary practices)

~~cannot be our Judge in all Points~~ 205
(Practices) has many Texts, wholly Un-
answerable; if this main Controversie
between us and the Sabbatharians be to be
tried by Scripture as the only Judge. And
it is impossible for you, by Scripture on-
ly, to convince the *Ethiopians*, who are
said to observe both the Saturday and
the Sunday; grounding themselves also
in the Apocryphal Recognitions of St.
Clement Lib. 7. C. 24. where the Saturday
is commanded to be kept, as well as the
Sunday. See *Bellar. Lib. de Scrip. in Clem.*

2. It is superfluous to cite the many
Texts, by which God commanded Rest
from all work upon the Saturday, which
was the seventh day, *because it was the day on
which our Lord rested.* And it was not any
one day in seven, but the seventh day, of
which (and not of any other among the
seven days) it is said; *And God bless'd the se-
venth day, and sanctify'd it; because in that (and
not in any other) he had rested from all his
work. Gen. 2.* How comes this Blessing gi-
ven to no other day among the seven, but
given to the seventh day only, to be lost?
Who took away the Sanctification of it,
given by God himself; and given for a
Reason, which is as obliging now as ever?
Give me a Text, which tells us (and
that clearly) that this Sanctification
was ever taken away. If you contend,
that a new Sanctification was given to the
Sunday,

206 *The Bible not containing all points,*

Sunday, because our Saviour did rest that day; let it be so, to the Honor of his Holy Name: But where do you read, that, at the giving of this new Sanctification (for which also you have no clear Text) the former Sanctification given to the Seventh day, on which God rested, was taken away from that day? Again, the day of our Saviours Ascension to Heaven was upon the *Thursday*, and that may, exceeding properly, be called the final Period of all his Actions: What clear Text of Scripture tells you, that any particular Sanctification was given to the *Sunday* in Honor of our Saviours Resurrection, more than was given to the *Thursday* in the Honor of his Ascension?

3. But standing to the new Scripture only, I will shew that we have stronger Texts, resting in the strength of the Text only, (as you will have us,) for still Sanctifying the Seventh day or *Saturday*, than for *Sunday*. I will give you Text for Text; and let any reasonable Man judge, whether the Text be not more clear for *Saturday*, than for *Sunday*. I have in the *Revelations*, that St. John was in the Spirit upon our Lords day, that is *Sunday*. What then? Is every day to be Sanctified, by abstaining all the World over from all work, because St. John had a Revelation on that day; as also he had
on

cannot be our Judge in all points. 207

on many other days? O but hence it is clear that there was such a day as our Lords day; so it is. But how do you prove from hence, that the Sanctification given to *Saturday*, was taken from that day? Or that there was given a Command to all the World, not to work upon that day which was called our Lords day? How prove you that by Scripture only; or that it was not the day of the Resurrection, or Ascension, or *Christmas-day* which *St. John* called our Lords day? Now give us as good an answer (if you can) to the Text I shall bring for still keeping the *Saturday*. We are still obliged to keep all those Commandments which our Saviour did bid us keep with his own Mouth; But he did with his own Mouth bid us keep the whole Decalogue, or those Ten Commandments given to *Moses*, in the very sense which the Jews understood them; Who did understand, that by *Remembering to Sanctifie the Sabbath day*, they were obliged to Sanctifie the *Saturday*. I prove what I have said out of the 10. of *St. Matt.* where we read that one came to our Saviour saying; *What good shall I do, that I may have everlasting Life?* Our Saviour answer'd; *If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandments.* And when that Man replyed to know what Commandments our Saviour meant?

our

208 *The Bible not containing all points;*

our dear Lord did clearly explicate himself, to mean all the Commandments of the Decalogue given to *Moses*; those very Commandments which this Man knew very well, as appears also by *Mark* 10. *Luke* 18. You see here the very Author of our new Law, with his own Mouth, requiring no less the keeping of this Commandment, as necessary for our entrance into life Everlasting, then the keeping of any other Commandment.

4. Give me your second Text for the *Sunday*, and I will return a more clear one for the *Saturday*. Your best Text is *Act.* 20. v. 7. *And upon the first day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break Bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the Morrow.* Hence (will you say) it appears, that the first Christians were accustomed to Communicate upon the first day of the Week, which was *Sunday*. I answer first, That it is not clear out of the Text that they used to do so, but that they did so that particular *Sunday*, of which a very good reason may be given out of the words following, telling us, that *St. Paul was ready to depart on the Morrow.* Wherefore those first fervent Christians might all assemble themselves to Communicate at the hands of so great an Apostle before his departure, and they

cannot be our Judge in all points. 209
they being Assembled, the Zealous
St. Paul made them a Sermon; but you
have no where that he Preached every
Sunday. But I have a clear Text for his
Preaching every Saturday; For he Disputed
in the Synagogue every Sabbath and he exhor-
ted the Jews and the Greeks, Act. 18. Again,
no wonder they Assembled to Commu-
nicate that day before St. Pauls departure,
because they were used then to Commu-
nicate every day, as many Doctors say,
or wonderful frequently, as is strongly
gather'd by that Text, Act. 2. 46. And
they continued daily (mark the word daily)
with one accord in the Temple, breaking Bread
from house to house. Thirdly, How do's
their Communicating upon Sunday take
away the Sanctification which God him-
self gave to the Seventh day, setting that
day apart from all servile work? Again,
do you think they never worked on that
day of their Communion, who commu-
nicated daily or exceeding frequently?
Is their Communicating once upon a Sun-
day enough to prove, that all the World
must never more work on the Sunday?
And that, from that day, it shall be ever
lawful to Work on the Saturday? Is such a
Text clear enough to abolish a Precept
clearly confirmed by the Mouth of the
Author of the new Law? My second
Text for still keeping Saturday, is far
clearer,

210 *The Bible not containing all points,*
clearer, out of 1 Cor. 7. 19. *Circumcision*
is nothing, and Prepuce is nothing, but the
Observation of the Commandments of God;
that is the thing we must now look after,
if we will have life Everlasting. Behold
here that great Apostle of the new Law
do's tell us, that even then *when Circum-*
cision was quite abolished and made *no-*
thing, yet the observation of the Com-
mandments (of which the Sanctifying
the Seventh day, or *Saturday,* was one)
did still stand good, and in its full obser-
vance; so that now we have our Saviour
himself, and three of the four Evange-
lists, and *St. Paul* for the observation of
the Seventh day, as much as for the keep-
ing of the other Commandments.

5. Let us hear your last Text, for you
have but Three. It is 1 Cor. 16. *Now*
concerning the Collections for the Saints, as I
have given order to the Churches of Galatia,
even so do ye upon the first day of the Week;
(that is, *Sunday*) *let every one of you lay by*
him in store as God hath prosper'd him, that
there be no gathering when I come. A
very weak place to abolish an old
known and still observed Command-
ment, confirmed by Christs mouth; and
to bring in a new obligation upon all the
World for ever. For I pray mark, that
it is not so much as said, that these Mo-
nies were to be gather'd when the people
did.

cannot be our Judge in all points. 211

did meet at the Church upon *Sundays*;
But, *Let every one lay up by himself in store*;
for which work some one day of the
Week was to be appointed; *St. Paul*
thought fit to appoint the first day for a
pious beginning. But how will you deduce
from hence by evident consequence (as
you must) that he gave them leave to
work the day before, and obliged them,
and all others not to work that day,
until the Worlds end? Neither this,
nor any other place can be brought out
of the whole Bible, from which this
consequence can be evidently inferr'd.
And now comes my turn, to give you a
Third and far more evident Text, for the
still Sanctifying the *Sabbath* or *Seventh*
day: for my Text shall shew, that stand-
ing to Scripture only, the Seventh day
was of Command to be observed long
after *St. Paul* did say those words, and
long after the practice of Communicat-
ing upon *Sundays* was in the Church. My
Text is *Matt. 24. v. 20. But pray you that*
your flight be not in the Winter, neither on
the Sabbath day. Hence our Saviour fore-
tells clearly the destruction of *Jerusalem*
(which was to happen in the year of our
Lord 73.) that is Forty years after the
Resurrection of Christ. Then, if ever,
a Man would think the Command for
the observation of the Sabbath, or
Seventh

212 *The Bible not containing all points,*

Seventh day, to have been abolished, so that it could not be prophaned; and yet our Saviour did bid his Apostles, (for to them he spoke these words;) *Pray that this flight might not be upon the Sabbath or Seventh day,* to avoid the profanation of that day; on which indeed *Jerusalem* was taken, and pillaged. And there was, besides a perpetual Massacring, a perpetual Pillaging, and carrying their Goods to places of security, as also a perpetual flight of those Jews which could flie, and carry away their Goods if they could, or endeavoring to carry them or sweating with incessant labor to hide them, by which action the Profanation might seem to be committed. Therefore all the places alledged before hand do not convince, that the obligation of not profaning the Sabbath day was taken away; as also they convince no new obligation of not working upon the *Sunday* to be brought in. For both these things I ask for Scripture, and nothing but Scripture; for it is nothing to our purpose to bring reasons, why the Sabbath might be taken away; and this obligation of not working upon the *Sunday* might be introduced: But you who affirm not the possibility only of the fact, but the real fact of abolishing *Saturday*, and of instituting *Sunday*.

cannot be our Judge in all Points. 213

day, you, I say, must prove both these things with clear Texts, or else your meer Discourses and Reasonings will not be half so good Arguments as our constant Tradition of the Church, which you absolutely deny to deliver down to us any necessary Obligation, not clearly express'd in Scripture. Your own Doctor Taylor, in his *Defence of Episcopacy*, p. 100. confesses the plain Truth. For that (says he, speaking of the keeping of the Sunday) in the New Testament we have no Precept, and nothing but the Example of the Primitive Disciples: At Geneva they were once about changing Sundays Feast into a Thursday, to shew their Christian Liberty. So he. Had the contrary been plainly set down, your so illuminated Brethren of Geneva should have seen it. Give me then infallible Texts, and not fallible Discourses, concerning the abrogating of the Saturday, and institution of the Sunday Feast in place of it.

6. But I have a new Difficulty in this Matter, which is objected by no body that I know of, because it is not very obvious. My Difficulty is this; That we are bound under pain of Damnation to keep our Sunday in a manner not only not express'd in any clear Scripture, but also against the usual manner of keeping the Sabbath, and all Festival days, express'd

214 *The Bible not containing all points,*
press'd in clear Scripture. For, according to clear Scripture, we are to begin the Sabbath or Feast on the Evening before, and to end it the next Evening; as is clear out of the twenty third Chapter of *Leviticus*, where all the old Sabbaths and Feasts, and the manner of keeping them, are put down; *From evening to evening shall you celebrate your Sabbaths.* It was then forbidden, under pain of Damnation, to work on *Friday* after the Evening; insomuch that a Taylor, Shomaker, Weaver, &c. who should have continu'd working for any long time between Sun-set and Twelve a clock at Night, should have been damn'd for his labor; and yet at the next Evening he might lawfully have work'd until Midnight: But I hope there is no such thing held lawful on *Sunday* after the Evening; neither is it unlawful to do any, tho' never so laborious Work, upon *Saturday* Evening, until Midnight. Here then you have another Obligation, under pain of Damnation, which is not plainly put down in Scripture, but deliver'd unto us by the Tradition of the same Church, which delivers the Obligation of Fasting in *Lent* unto us. Wherefore none of you all can shew any ground upon which any Obligation of keeping the *Sunday*, and keeping of it in this manner

cannot be our Judge in all points. 215

manner (which I now specified) can be grounded solidly ; but upon the very self-same Ground we will as solidly ground the Obligation of keeping *Lent* with a Fast of Precept (as I shew'd *Sect. 8. n. 8.*) as much as *Sunday* is a Feast of Precept. This Argument will trouble Dr. *Fern*, who, *Sect. 13.* most inconsequently to his other Principles, holds the Obligation of keeping the Lord's Day, made plainly known unto us by Tradition only : And yet holds, That in the Scripture only all necessary Obligations are set down plainly. Plain contradiction.

Sect. 10.

A Fourteenth Argument. By the Texts which our Adversaries bring to prove, that Scripture contains and decides all necessary Controversies, we prove the contrary.

1. **A**Ll of you say, That all things which are necessary to be believ'd or done for obtaining Salvation, are clearly put down in Scripture : Therefore if it be necessary to our Salvation to believe Scripture to be by it self alone our only Rule of Faith, or to hold, that by it self alone it decides all necessary Controversies, the Scripture must also be shew'd by you clearly to contain and de-

216 *The Bible not containing all points,*
determine all this: For else you press
us to hold that which no clear Scripture
bids us to hold; which thing you all ac-
count unreasonable in us. Your Part is
here Affirmative; and in this prime
Point you contradict the Practice of all
the Church: Against so great and so pub-
lick Authority, you must bring the Evi-
dence of clear Scripture, according to
your own Principles. If we then can
but shew, that all the Texts you bring
do not suffice to this Evidence, you are
condemn'd even by your own Principles.
Let us then hear your Texts, and that
out of Dr. Fern, for he hath the chief
of them.

2. The first Text which is brought
by Dr. Fern, laboring in his Sect. 23. to
satisfie my Doubt, is this; *For in them*
(the Scriptures) *ye think ye have Salvati-*
on, John. 5. v. 39. I pray mark what I
say, and you shall see how weak this
and other such like Arguments are. In
the seventeenth Verse of this Chapter
begins a Discourse of our Saviour's to
the Jews; and when he comes to the
thirty fourth Verse, he says, *These things*
I say unto you, that you may be saved. Now
my Answer is this: That which our Sa-
viour said unto them *that they might be*
saved, is a stronger Proof, that that alone
by it self was sufficient to Salvation,
without

cannot be our Judge in all points. 217

without any thing else; than to say, *The Jews did think by such a thing to have Salvation; Therefore that thing by it self alone do's (without doing any more) suffice to Salvation.* For undoubtedly our Saviour's saying such a thing, is better than the Jews thinking such a thing. This suppos'd, would you not count him mad who should say, that those precedent Verses, which our Saviour had then said when he spoke these words, *These things I say unto you that you may be sav'd*, did contain alone a clear Expression of all particular necessary Points, distinctly putting them all down? How then do's it follow, that because the Jews did think (and perhaps truly think) to find that which might save them in the Scripture, therefore the Scripture did contain alone a clear expression of all particular necessary Points, distinctly putting them all down? Wherefore, as you must not understand that short Speech made by our Saviour to have suffic'd to Salvation, by expressing distinctly all particular Points necessary; but because it did suffice to bring them to the knowledge of the true Messias, whom they acknowledging, might, by his particular Instruction, know distinctly all particular necessary Points: so the Scripture did suffice to Salvation, by expressing clearly enough

L

that

218 *The Bible not containing all points,*
that *Jesus Christ* was the true Saviour of
the world; whom they could not but
believe, if they would believe *Moses*:
For had ye believ'd Moses, ye would have
believ'd me, for he wrote of me, saith our
Lord in the same Chapter, v. 46. Be-
lieving then our Saviour, they should
from him (and his Church after him)
receive full Instruction in every particu-
lar necessary Point. But Dr. *Fern* ur-
geth this place wonderful weakly; Be-
cause (saith he) they might know all
things necessary to Salvation (by Scrip-
ture only), therefore he bids them *search*
the Scripture, and they should find *they*
testified, of him. A weak Consequence,
to prove that they might know all ne-
cessary Points out of Scripture, because
they might know this one Point of our
Saviour's being the true Messias. For it
is no Consequence, This one Point is
clear in Scripture; therefore all other
necessary Points are clear in Scripture.
My second Answer is, *Go and search the*
Scriptures now, and you shall find Sal-
vation in them; for they will clearly
send you to the Church for your parti-
cular Instruction in all Points necessary,
as I shew'd *Sect. 7. n. 1.* Thirdly, *Search*
the Scriptures, and you shall find Salvation
in them; but not in them as expounded
by every man for himself (for these very
men

cannot be our Judge in all points. 219

men found not Salvation by them, as they understood them;) but you shall find Salvation by them as expounded by the publick Interpretation of the Church. And as it is no Consequence, *Christ* did bid the Jews search those Scriptures which they had then, because in them they should find clearly put down that one Point of his being the Messias; therefore those Scriptures, and all the New Testament (of which no one word was then written) are affirm'd by *Christ* to contain all Points now necessary, and to put all down clearly: so also it is no Consequence, *Christ* bid us *search the Scriptures*; therefore we are to attend to them alone, and not to attend also to the Voice of his heavenly Father, bidding us *hear him*; nor to the Voice of *Christ* himself, testifying of himself; nor to the Voice of his Miracles, which he calls *a testimony greater than John*. Nor are we to attend to the Voice of *John*, altho' he was sent on purpose to *bear witness of the Light*, Jo. 1. 7, 8. And yet all these Consequences be as good as this your Consequence, *Christ bids us search the Scriptures, therefore we must attend to them alone, and take them alone to be of sufficient Authority to ground Faith in all Points necessary, and not attend to the Church*. I will give you a Consequence,

220 *The Bible not containing all points,*
tho' most bad, yet to the full as good as
this: St. Paul saith, *If women will learn
any thing, let them ask their husbands at
home,* (1 Cor. 14. 35.) Therefore Women
are to attend only to what their Huf-
bands teach them at home, and not to
go to the Church to be instructed in
Points necessary by the Minister. But
after all this, I must tell you (Mr. Do-
ctor) for a *fourth Answer*, That you as-
sume that which it is impossible for any
of us all to prove; that is, that our
Saviour did bid them search the Scrip-
tures. St. John did write in Greek, and
the Greek word (*Exeunato*) as also the La-
tin (*Scrutamini*) do's as commonly and as
properly signifie *You do search* (in the In-
dicative Mode), as *Do search* (in the Im-
perative): and therefore the Translator
of your Bible might, according to the
Original, as well have put it, not as he
did, but thus; *You do search the Scriptures,*
because ye think ye have Salvation in them;
of which notwithstanding they did miss
with all their search. If we read (as
we may) *You do search*, then this place
evidently proves, that the search of the
Scriptures only doth not suffice to Salva-
tion: and therefore it is as probable (to
the very full) that this Text makes
against you, as that it makes for you.
And this Interpretation of mine is not
only

cannot be our Judge in all points. 221

only the interpretation of St. Cyril Lib. 3. in Jo. c. 4. but also your learned Beza saith; *I do assent to Cyril expressly admonishing that these Words (Ereunato) &c. ought rather to be taken in the Indicative mode, You do search the Scriptures.* How often have Protestants heard us give this unavoidable answer; and yet they, being never able to answer it, will never give over the citing of it, as if it were a main proof of this Fundamental Point of their Religion? An evident sign of their want of evident Texts. Again, the knowledge of the only Rule of Faith is necessary for all: But Christ did not bid all common people *search the Scriptures*; for at that time the Scriptures were not in the Syriak Language at all; which only Language the people of the Jews could understand. See this Proved Sect. 2. N. 11.

3. Dr. Ferns Second Text is; They (the Scriptures) *are able to make wise unto Salvation.* He presseth it thus; *Can that be said to be able to make a Man wise to such a purpose and only do in part, and imperfectly, teaching him only some knowledges to that purpose?* Also he saith after, v. 17. *The Man of God is thoroughly furnished, or perfected to every good work.* I answer, that the short speech which our Saviour made, intending it (as I shewed in the former

222 *The Bible not containing all points,*
Objection) *to make those wise to Salvation*; was truly able to do what he intended, and that perfectly; or else he had missed in the choice of a means sufficient to that end, which he clearly said he intended; to wit, *that they might be saved*. Yet you cannot say, that speech, by it self alone, sufficed *to make them wise to Salvation*; but it did inable them with sufficient Principles, by following of which, Salvation might be effectually obtained; and so that Speech was able, not in part and imperfectly only, to work the effect, by giving some knowledge to that purpose; but that very knowledge which that short Speech gave, was a knowledge effectual for the direction of all those *Jews*; not by directing them in every particular, but by telling them clearly whence all particular directions were to be had, which any one following will soon prove *a Man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works*. Is not all this true even of that short Speech? Much more is it true of so many Speeches made to us in Scripture *for our Salvation*, and able to bring us effectually to it, if we follow them, especially such Speeches as bid us so often to follow the Church. See the many places I cited S. 7. N. 1. These Scriptures then so full of these Speeches, and these Divine writings Expounded, not by private,
(not by O) 8 1 but

cannot be our Judge in all points. 223

but by publick exposition of the Church, do not in part only and imperfectly, work this effect, by teaching us some knowledges to that effect; but they teach us a great sum of such knowledges, as are able to effect the work, tho' not by giving us every particular Point to be done, but by telling us whence every particular Point might securely be had. Yet to give you fuller satisfaction; I say, it was far from St. Paul's mind to say the Scriptures are able to make us wise to Salvation, as they are used by those, who take them as interpreted according to that Sense, that every man shall in his Conscience judge to be true. The Scripture thus taken, breed's infinite inconveniences, as I shewed at large Sect. 7. Whence appears that the Scriptures used so, are the cause of many mens damnation. St. Paul then did not speak of the Scriptures taken so (as you do;) but he said, *They were able to make Timothy wise to Salvation*; because he was indeed a Man of God who did continue in the things which he learned and had been assured of; to wit, by the oral Tradition of the Doctors of the Church, and by St. Paul himself: For so St. Paul teacheth me in the beginning of his former Chapter, saying to Timothy, *Thou therefore (my Son) be strong in the grace, that is in Christ Jesus, and in the things which thou hast heard of me*

224 *The Bible not containing all points,*
among many witnesses. And in the Chapter
before that v. 13. *Hold fast the form of*
sound words which thou hast heard of me. Yea,
and in this third Chapter, *But thou hast*
fully known my Doctrine, Manner of life, &c.
All this Doctrine he could not have known
by any Scripture, of which a small part
was then written. Give me then a *Timo-*
thy, a man so well preinstructed by Tra-
dition, so fast a holder of Traditions, and
a man so knowing from whom he had
learned these things; and I will freely
allow you, that the *Scriptures will make*
such a man wise to Salvation: For he will be
sure to take them, not upon any private
mans Judgment, or upon his own; but
to take them as interpreted by the
Church, whom he will be sure never to
contradict; she being the Pillar and
Ground of Truth, as that his great Master
saith, *All whose Doctrine he fully knew.* But
those Scriptures which *are able to make such*
a man of God, such a Timothy, wise to Sal-
vation, and thoroughly furnished or perfected to
every good work, are not able to do this
effect, if used in a manner contrary to
that which I have shewed they were used
by him, and should be used by us. We do a-
buse them if we take them and discanon
them (as I may say) by our private In-
terpretations, contrary to the Tradition,
and unanimous exposition of the Church.
These

cannot be our Judge in all points. 225

These men use Scriptures *to their perdition* as St. Peter said some did the hard places of St. Pauls Epistles: Whence you see that Misinterpretations of *hard places* were made *to the perdition* of the Interpreters. Wonder not then to hear us say that the obscurity of some places of Scripture have occasioned the perdition of the false Interpreters of those places, out of which state of perdition some Guide there must be who can lead them securely: Can you find me a surer than the Church? There is no want of Infallibility in Scripture, but there is great abundance of fallibility in our private Judgment of discretion, which makes us need a sure Guide in the Interpretation thereof.

4. Having now shewed in what Sense the Text alledged did say, *The Scripture was able to make a Man wise to Salvation*; I shall easily shew how weekly from these words St. Paul is said to have meant, *That the Scripture by it self alone was sufficient for Doctrin, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the Man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works.* I then freely grant the Scripture sufficient for all this, but still in the same Sense that I have explicated the Scripture to be able to make a man wise to Salvation; to wit, as interpreted by the Church, or as understood by

226 *The Bible not containing all points,*
men well preinstructed by Tradition,
who will be sure in all doubts to have
recourse to the Church; and esteem as
much what Tradition teacheth the A-
postles to have said, as what their Books
teach them to have written: Their words
being of the same Authority unwritten
as written; and Tradition being a more
uncorrupt deliverer of their Doctrin,
than writing; which is subject to be so
many ways corrupted, and altered, and
of which we are only certified that it is
Apostolical by the Tradition of the self
same Church, which do's as well certifie
us that other Doctrins be Apostolical, be-
sides those written in this Book. Here
also I must tell you how Mr. Fisher did
excellently silence Dr. White, when in
their publick conference he urged, this
Text, *The Scriptures is profitable, &c.* For,
said he, *Altho' Wood be profitable to make the
substance of a House, to make Wainscot, Stools,
Tables, and other furniture; yet hence do's not
follow Wood alone is sufficient to build and fur-
nish a House: So Scripture is profitable for all
these ends, but alone it is not sufficient.* Whence
all the weight of your Argument comes
to this; that if it be so profitable as to
make a Man wise to Salvation, it must
be sufficient by it self alone to do so:
Which I have already shewed to be false;
without you take the whole Canon of
Scripture

cannot be our Judge in all points. 227

Scripture as interpreted by the Holy Church, or as understood by those who are preinstructed by Traditions, as *Timothy* was.

5. Indeed you say, *this sufficiency belongs to the whole Scripture, tho' in proportion only to every Book*; and therefore the Apostle said, *That Scriptures are able to make a Man wise to Salvation*. How they are able to do this, I have shewed; But M. Doctor, of what Scriptures did St. Paul say these Words? If he did not say these Words of the whole Canon of the Scriptures which we now have, and to which you stretch these Words; this place cannot possibly prove that this sufficiency belongs to the whole Scripture we now have: But it is evident he did not speak these Words of the whole Canon of the Scripture which we now have; for almost all the new Scripture was as then not written. How could that, which was not at all, have a being then able to make *Timothy* wise to Salvation? St. Paul spoke of the sufficiency (if you please) of all Scriptures which were then extant. You deny this sufficiency to them, and you say: *It belongs to the whole Scripture, tho' in proportion to every Book*: Therefore it belonged in proportion only to those Books which were written then. Why did St. Paul then say

228 *The Bible not containing all points,*
say of those Books then extant, that they
were able to make a Man wise to Salvati-
on? Now answer your own Argument.
Again, if every Book of Scripture con-
tributes its proportionable part; to make
up a whole Body of Books compleatly
sufficient to this purpose; how will you
do now, when no fewer than twenty
Books of the Scripture are quite lost, as I
have shew'd *Scet. 1. N. 7*? We have not
any thing like a Text, by which we can
prove that these twenty Books were not
as requisite to make up this full sufficien-
cy of the whole Canon, to decide all
Controversies, as any other twenty
which we have; especially, if you except
the four Gospels. And yet the Original
of one of these Gospels is also quite lost;
and we have no surer ground for that Be-
lief, by which we believe our selves to
have the true Copy of it, than the Tra-
dition of the Church; if she be fallible
in her Traditions, we cannot believe any
thing in St. Matthew's Gospel; as I shew-
ed, *Scet. 6.*

6. Whereas you object, that, *Tho' the*
Scripture did contain more things plainly in it
self, and shew us from whence we may have
the rest, that is, from the Church: Yet thus
the Scripture could not be said to make us per-
fect, for so the Law might be said to make
us perfect, because it sheweth us Christ, and

was

cannot be our Judge in all points. 229
was a Schoolmaster to him; Gal. 3. And
John Baptist might have been said to have
perfected his Disciples by shewing them Christ.
So you. I answer, that you all fight a-
gainst this Objection with every Text
you bring in this Controversie against
us: For as the two former, so all the
following Texts objected against us,
speak of the Old Testament, or Law; for
In that (Christ said) the Jews thought to find
Salvation; of that he said, Search the
Scriptures; of that St. Paul said, It was able
to make a Man wise to Salvation, it was pro-
fitable, so that by it the Man of God is
thoroughly furnished or perfected, (mark that
word) to every good work. And now, be-
hold you your self come and infer for an
absurdity, that the old Scripture should
be able to do this. We freely acknow-
ledge that the Law of it self could perfect
no Man, no nor justifie any Man, as St.
Paul clearly saith in the place cited; but
they were all to be justified by Faith in
Christ. The Law, as introducing to this,
did sufficiently perfect all those, who were
perfect under the Law; independently of
this, it did not do so. As for St. John,
you are clearly told by St. Luke C. 1. v. 13.
that he was sent *Parare Domino plebem per-
fectam*, to prepare to our Lord a perfect People:
And towards the end of that Chapter,
*Thou Child shalt be call'd the Propbet of the
Highest:*

230 *The Bible not containing all points, Highest; for thou shalt go before the Face of the Lord to prepare his ways, to give knowledge of Salvation unto his People by the remission of their Sins.* Can you shew the Scripture doth more in this Point than it saith St. John did?

7. Your third Text is, *You shall not add to the word which I speak unto you, nor take from it. Deut. 4. 2.* Therefore the Scripture is so perfect, and so sufficient, that it alone contains all necessities; *and therefore condemns the superadded Traditions.* You have forgot, Mr. Doctor, your very last words, *That the Law* (chiefly contain'd in Deuteronomy) *could not make us perfect:* And now you bring these words as words implying the perfection and sufficiency of it; for of it alone these words are spoken. Secondly, You have forgot your very first words of this your 23. Sect. where you put three sorts of Tradition that you allow there, and Sect. 13. Be not these additions to the Written Word? Thirdly, You have forgot, that the Jews had at least two undeniable Traditions, besides those which deliver'd the Scriptures, and the true Sense of the Scriptures unto them: For they knew only by Tradition, *what remedy was to be us'd to free their Female-Children from Original Sin; as also, to free their Male-Children in danger of death before the eighth day.* This remedy they knew
and

cannot be our Judge in all points. 231

and observ'd, and were bound to know and observe. And yet they infallibly knew it without having any Scripture expressing to them the knowledge of this remedy, or of their obligation to use it; or that it was so necessary for the Salvation of their Children, whom they did believe to be in Original Sin, and by that debarr'd from Salvation, unless some remedy were applied. Some remedy surely was as necessary for the Female, as Circumcision for the Male: Shew me this Remedy in Scripture. *Secondly*, They truly believ'd some of those Bloody Sacrifices to have been appointed unto them by God, for the expiation of their Sins; but they could not truly believe, that any of those Sacrifices could expiate their Sins by its own Vertue: They believ'd then, that those Sacrifices had this Expiative Vertue from the Merits of *Christ*: Shew me any Text in which this was then written. It is ridiculous to say, that this Faith was not necessary to that Church, at least, so as to be believ'd by some among them. *Fourthly*, Mr. Doctor, you forget against whom you bring this Testimony: If it belongs only to the *Jews*; why do you bring it against Christians? If it belongs also to Christians; why do you not Circumcise your selves? You urge against us, *Ye shall*
not

232 *The Bible not containing all points,*
not add: We urge against you, *Ye shall*
not diminish. *Fifthly*, Mr. Doctor, you
forget that you are to conclude thus;
The whole Canon of Scripture is a sufficient
direction for us: and you conclude, that
the *Law of Moses is a sufficient direction for*
us; which you and yours confess to be
false. *Sixthly*, You forget that a whole
score of Books are diminish'd from the
Canon by being quite lost; half a score
more you will take from us, and cast a-
mongst the *Apocrypha*. Do you think that
no part of this sufficiency is wanting to
such a Canon as you now have? Give me
your Text for that. *Seventhly*, You forget,
that it is impossible for you to prove, that
the Scriptures must be taken either as
they sound, or taken by every Man in
that sense that he in his own Conscience
judgeth. Give us the Scriptures taken in
the Sense which the Visible Church judg-
eth (for the Judge of the Sense must be
visible,) and we will grant all. For then
without any addition, and by only true
Interpretation, we will prove, that we
must take the Church for our Infallible
Guide; and she will shew us Scripture
rightly by her interpreted, for the admit-
ting of unwritten Tradition. In the mid-
dle of this your sevenfold forgetfulness I
pray remember what pitiful Texts you
have put in the forefront, to prove that,
which,

cannot be our Judge in all points. 233

which, if not prov'd better, your Religion would prove most pitifully grounded. The sense of the words which you urge is literally this; Let no Man presume by his private Interpretations to deprave any Law, either by restraining, or stretching the natural signification of the words in which it is deliver'd. For Example, God in *Deuteronomy 17. v. 11, 12.* saith, *Thou shalt not decline from the Sentence which they* (that is the High Priests) *shall shew thee, to the Right-hand nor to the Left. And the Man that will do presumptuously, and will not bearken unto the Priest, even that Man shall die.* God would not have this Law deprav'd by such an Interpretation as you use to give, that the Sentence is to be follow'd of those Judges which God appointed to tell you what was Gods Law rightly understood, if they give Sentence according to Scripture, as you would have it Expounded.

8. Your fourth Text out of the end of the *Revelations* is incomparably weaker, and it evidently damneth your Father *Luther* and *Lutheran Brethren* unto Hell; For *St. John* testifies to every Man that heareth the words of the Prophecie of this Book (he speaks of the *Revelations* only :) If any Man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the Plagues which are written in this Book. And if any Man shall
take

234 *The Bible not containing all points,*
take away from the words of the Book of
this Propheſie, God ſhall take his part out of
the Book of Life, and out of the Holy City.
But Luther took away all the words of the
Book of this Propheſie, when he ſaid in his
firſt Preface to the New Teſtament, *that he*
receiv'd this Book, neither for Prophetical nor
Apoſtolical: Therefore God ſhall take his
part out of the Book of Life, and out of the Ho-
ly City. The ſame ſhall be done to his
Lutheran Diſciples. Thus you ſee I have
concluded evidently what I ſaid, let us
hear you conclude; *Nothing muſt be ad-*
ded to this Book, therefore all the Scripture is
ſufficient to decide all Controverſies; tho'
twenty whole Books of it be loſt, and tho'
you take all the Texts of the whole Ca-
non in that ſenſe which every Man in his
Conſcience thinks beſt: Thus in effect
you conclude. Note alſo, that there is no
kind of certainty that the *Apocalyps* was
the laſt Book of Scripture; for you own
Kemnitius holds St. *John's* Goſpel written
after that; and moſt hold his Epiſtles the
very laſt part of Scripture. Now mark,
that the very laſt Verſes, which were
written in his laſt Epiſtle are, *I had many*
things to write (now when all the Scrip-
ture was written:) *But I will not with Ink*
and Pen write unto thee. But I truſt I ſhall
ſhortly ſee thee, and we ſhall ſpeak Face to
Face. Peace be to thee. Now for Gods
ſake,

cannot be our Judge in all points. 235

fake, what Text assures you (for all other assurances we by your own principles reject;) what Text (I say) assures you, that those things which St. John *had yet to write*, but did express them by Mouth only, were all of them things unnecessary.

9. Your fifth Text, Gal. i. 8. *Tho' we or an Angel from Heaven preach another Gospel unto you, than that which we have Preached unto you; let him be accursed. As I said before, so I say now again; If any Man Preach another Gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed.* First, Mr. Doctor you forget, that in the beginning and in other parts of your Book, you will have our Church to be one and the same with yours in such fundamentals as constitute a Church; and will you now prove this Church, by the sentence of the Apostle to have been Accursed, Anathematized, and Excommunicated, or cut off from the true Church? You must sweat to find God a true Church upon Earth, if ours stood Excommunicated by St. Paul ever since it held Traditions. Secondly, You forget that you bring this Curse upon your own head, for it is you who Preach another Gospel from that which St. Paul Preached, and that which we received from him, *To stand fast and hold the Traditions which we have learned, whether by word*

236 *The Bible not containing all points,*
word or Epistle, 2 Thes. 2. 15. And sure
we are that the Epistles to the *Thessalonians*
did not contain the whole Gospel: If
they did, then find in those Epistles, that
you must take the Scripture only for
your Rule in all Points of Faith, and all
other necessary Points. It is also the
Doctrin of St. Paul, *The things which thou*
hast heard of me before many Witnesses, the
same commend thou unto faithful men, which
shall be fit to teach others also, 2 Tim. 2. 2.
You will have us commend to other
men, not those things which were only
heard before many Witnesses by publick Tra-
dition, but only such as are written: You
therefore gainsay St. Paul, and on you
the Curse of his Excommunication falls.
Where you see, by the way, a good rea-
son, why we could not hold you in our
Communion, you being Anathematiz'd
by St. Paul himself. We then, conforma-
bly to the Doctrin of St. Paul, say that
the Gospel which he Preached unto them,
and the Gospel which they had received
(see his first Epistle to them *Cap. 1, and 2.*)
was a Gospel, which is most truly ex-
pounded by us to contain both his un-
written and written Doctrin; yet in all
probability very little of the Gospel had
been, as then, delivered in writing unto
the *Galatians*; or tell me how much if
you can? Sure I am, that besides what
was

cannot be our Judge in all points. 237

was written, they were yet to receive much more in writing: Yea the surest opinion is, that the first thing that ever St. Paul did write was the very Epistle to the *Galatians*, as is well proved by the Remish Testament in the Preface of the Epistle to the *Romans*. And you can bring nothing but conjectures to affirm that he had deliver'd at this time any written Gospel at all unto them. Again you most unskilfully say, *that this Text must be meant of the written Gospel only, for that which is written bears (you mean only) the name of Gospel*; for First, this very place proves the contrary. Secondly, Many other places shew the contrary, for in St. Matthew c. 4. v. 23. *Jesus went about all Galilee preaching the Gospel*; What Gospel was then Written? And c. 9. v. 35. *Jesus went about all the Cities and Villages Preaching the Gospel*; What Gospel was then Written? Or Written when our Saviour said; *Wheresoever this Gospel shall be Preached*, c. 26. v. 13. St. Mar. c. 1. v. 14. *Jesus came into Galilee Preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, saying, Repent and believe the Gospel*. What Written Gospel did they know? Or St. Peter, to whom in the 10th. Chapter Christ speaks about leaving Goods for the Gospel. And thus, I might run over the new Testament, where the word *Gospel* is so often taken
for

238 *The Bible not containing all points,*
for the Doctrin delivered by word of
Mouth; and perhaps not thrice in
all Scripture it is clearly taken for the
Written Gospel. And also *To Evangelize*
is far more frequently taken
for Preaching the unwritten Word,
than the written. This Text then
most convincingly proves that St. Paul
commands them by no means to go
against the Doctrin received by Tradition.
As for St. Austin's Authority, with
which you back your Interpretation,
Bellarmin told you truly, that he did
not expound this Text, but did only
cite it to prove that nothing was to
be believed against Scripture: No nor be-
sides Scripture Interpreted truly by the
publick Authority of the Church, as I
said before: And this Answer satisfies
what you bring out of St. Jerom; altho'
indeed he speaks of those who bring not
known and publick Tradition of the
Church; but of those who devise new
things, and give them out for old Traditi-
ons, which not being true Traditions de-
liver'd by the Church, must needs be of
no Authority, without they can prove
their truth by Scripture, which they
cannot prove by true Tradition.

10. It is therefore false which you
say, that in the Judgment of St. Aug.
and St. Jerom. It is enough to incur
the

cannot be our Judge in all points. 239

the Anathema, if they teach any thing of Faith besides that which is received from Scripture, in the sense you take this word *Besides*. It is also impossible to shew that *St. Paul* there spoke of Scripture. Yea he speaks of that which they *had received from him*, who never writ any thing before that Epistle, as I said; neither do we teach any thing of Faith *besides* that which hath Authority from the Scripture, tho' not from the Scripture Expounded as private men think fittest, but from Scripture rightly expounded by the Church, to which we add nothing but what Scripture bids us add. Wherefore the Authorities you cite are ill applied to us, for we speak nothing without Authority and Testimony of the Scripture taken in this manner, as it should ever be, neither add we any thing what is not written; For it is written, *Hold ye the Traditions*. If you say, this is no true Tradition. I am by Scripture bid to hear the Church before you. Note, that it is a very good Argument to say, it is no where written, therefore it is not to be admitted; if this Argument be only used as the Fathers use it, that is, when it was notorious that such a thing was not deliver'd by Tradition; For what is not deliver'd by Church Tradition, must be proved by Scripture. See S. 12.

N.6. You see what little need we have to Interpret the words, *besides what I have Preached*, to be the same, as if he had said, *Contrary to what I Preached*. Yet because this is very true, it is justified by *Bellarmin*; and you, not going about to answer so much as one of the proofs, deserve no Answer. Yet mark what *St. Paul* says, *Rom. 16. I desire you Brethren to mark them who make dissensions and scandals* (note the next word) *contrary to the Doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them*. Who are contrary to what was deliver'd to the Roman Church, to which *St. Paul* did write these words? Who be they? mark them, avoid them.

II. Your sixth Objection is no Text, but an Argument drawn from this Text, *To mans Testament no one adds*, *Gal. 3.15. Much less is it lawful to add to Gods Testament*, say you. We Answer, that we add nothing to Gods Testament: but with all reason we still stand to have it Interpreted, not by any mans private Authority. For what Commonwealth permits the Testaments and Last wills of Man to be so Interpreted? Let us have Gods Testament both new and old, Interpreted by that publick Authority impower'd by Gods commission to this end, and we require no more. Less than this cannot in reason be required: so that your Jest of a Will partly written

cannot be our Judge in all points. 241

written, partly nuncupatory, is lost. No Wills worse made than those which concern many intricate Matters belonging to very several Persons, and yet prohibiting any Court in the World to interpret them, but do let the Sense be judg'd by every one concern'd in it. In-
somuch that tho' *Christ*, in four several places of his Will, clearly tells us, that he leaves us the inestimable Legacy of his precious Body and Blood, and that his Flesh is truly Meat, &c. yet by private Interpretations it shall be lawful to tell us, that we must have only a Figure and Sign of his Body. Would any Man admit of the Figure or Picture of a Horse or House, in place of a Horse or House given him by Legacy? Shall there be no Court in the World to prevent these Inconveniences? Thus you would have *Christ* make his Testament. Who has so little Discourse, as to think a Testament, left to no Courts Interpretation in the World, to be a fit Judge, by its own Evidence, when twenty or thirty Leafs can be prov'd to be missing unto it? And yet to the whole Testament, New and Old, Twenty whole Books be missing, as I have prov'd *Seet. 1. n. 7.* and half a score more be most unjustly pull'd out of the Canon by you, and cast among the Apocrypha. And yet

M

you

242 *The Bible not containing all points,*
you would have all us stake our Souls
upon the full assurance we have, that this
broken Testament, taken thus, and also
taken as it is expounded by you, against
Fathers, Councils, and the constant Judg-
ment of the greater sort of the present
Christian World, and the known Judg-
ment of all the Christian World for a
thousand years together. What more
unreasonable? *With Mans Testament none*
deals thus, much less with Gods.

12. I must needs also put you in
mind, that you are much mistaken
when you say, that the word *Testament*
signifies only a written Testament: For
our Saviour in his last Supper said, *This*
is the Blood of the New Testament, Matth.
26. 28. *Mark* 14. 24. and again, *This Cup*
is the New Testament in my Blood, which
(Cup) is shed for you. Here we have the
New Testament made by unwritten
Words, eight years before one Word of
it was written, and well towards eighty
years before all of it was written to the
end. Having then shew'd, that the
Words *Gospel* and *New Testament*, accord-
ing to Scripture, do most properly sig-
nifie the unwritten Word of *Christ*; we
may confidently say, that we add no-
thing to the Gospel of *Christ*, or the New
Testament. If you ask, how I know
what was deliver'd by *Christs* unwritten
Gospel

cannot be our Judge in all points. 243

Gospel and New Testament? I easily answer; *I know this* by the Testimony of the self-same always visible Church, by whose Testimony you know that such Books contain *Christs* written Gospel, and written New Testament. *I know this* by the Tradition of the same Church, by which only all Christians did know it for those seventy or eighty years which pass'd between the Passion of *Christ*, and the finishing his written Gospel or New Testament. *I know this* by a better Testimony than all the World knew the Articles necessary to Salvation, before any *one word* of Scripture was written, which time contains above Two thousand years: for if the Tradition of that Church, in the Law of Nature, were sufficient to ground the infallible Assurance of all the Articles believ'd by that Church for Two thousand years, I hope the Tradition of the Church, which is now in the Law of Grace, is yet a more strong ground to assure me of that unwritten Doctrin of *Christ* deliver'd far more publickly by him and his Apostles, than that unwritten Word of God was deliver'd in the Law of Nature to some few Patriarchs, in a manner very private, in comparison of *Christs* unwritten Doctrin, as shall be said *Seet. 16. n. 2.*

13. *Your sixth and last Text* here ob-

244 *The Bible not containing all points,*
jected is our Saviour's Speech, *Matth. 15.*
taken from *Isa. 29. 13.* *Their fear towards*
me is taught by the precepts of men. Whence
you infer, *That all things of Worship or*
Faith necessary to Salvation, which are not
commanded or written, are to be condemn'd.
Before I return answer, give me leave to
tell you whose Language you speak,
when you deliver this your own Do-
ctrin. St. *Austin (contra Maximum, lib. 1.)*
brings in his *Arian Heretic* speaking
thus to the Catholics: *If you bring any*
thing from the Scripture, it is necessary that
we hear it: But these words which be besides
Scripture, are in no case receiv'd of us, seeing
our Lord do's admonish us, saying, In vain
they worship me, teaching the commandments
of men. So that Heretic. Just so you
and yours. I answer, first, That many
things may be commanded by God, and
yet not written, and so be the Precepts
not of Men, but of God, tho' we be as-
sured of them by Men. For all Precepts
which were for those Two thousand
years and more, concerning Worship or
Faith, necessary in those Ages to Salva-
tion, before the first Scriptures were
written, were truly the Precepts and Do-
ctrin of God, and as such to be observ'd;
tho' this Obligation was notified only by
the Men of that Church. For example:
The Fall of *Adam*, and the Promise
made

cannot be our Judge in all points. 245

made of our future Redemption, was notified by *Adam's* Children, who deliver'd the same to their Children, and so downwards. So we read, *Gen. 9. That God said to Noe and his sons, that it was not permitted them to eat blood, v. 4.* This Precept was obliging to all the World, upon the credit of the Tradition of so few. So likewise we read in *Genesis 17. That when Abraham was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared unto him, and made a Covenant with him and his Seed, to make him the Father of the Faithful, to bless all in his Seed: And then he gave him, and all his Posterity, a most strict Precept of Circumcision. All this Abraham only notified to his Posterity: They all believ'd this Promise and Covenant of God, and they all strictly observ'd this Precept of Circumcision: And yet neither this Precept, nor this Covenant, were written for those Four hundred years and more which passed between the time of Abraham and Moses, the first Scripture-writer. Was that unwritten Covenant the Doctrin of Man? Was Circumcision the Precept of Man? No. Was the Precept of not eating Blood the Precept of Man? And yet by Tradition it had all its force, even from Noe to *Christ's* time among the Gentiles, and until the times of *Moses* among the*

246 *The Bible not containing all points,*

Jews. Well then, why should the unwritten Doctrin and Precepts of *Christ* and his Apostles be call'd the Doctrin and Precepts of Men? You can say nothing, but that the Testimony of Men is not sufficient ground for us to hold this Doctrin and these Precepts to be Divine or Apostolical; which is apparently false: For the Men of the Church of *Christ*, and the Supreme Pastors and Governors thereof, cannot be of less Credit and Authority, than were the Men of the Law of Nature, or of the Seed of *Abraham*, or the Testimony of *Noe* and his Sons. Their Testimony could and did suffice to make their Doctrin and Precepts, deliver'd by God in a far more private manner, to be notwithstanding prudently believ'd, and embrac'd for Divine. Why then should not the Testimony of the Church suffice to make the unwritten Doctrin of *Christ* and his Apostles to be held for Divine? It is therefore no kind of Proof to say, *Christ reprehends Human Doctrins and Precepts; therefore we must not embrace Divine Doctrins and Precepts, meerly because they are not written.* You embrace the Doctrin of Men, who tell us this Doctrin of yours, which is neither written nor deliver'd by universal Tradition. Again, Were not all the Precepts and Doctrins

cannot be our Judge in all points. 247

Doctrins of *Christ* believ'd as Divine for those Fourscore years or thereabouts before the whole Canon of Scripture was finish'd? Of all these Traditions see my *Sect. 16. n. 1, 2.* and the whole *19. Sect.* Secondly, I pray how do you avoid embracing the Doctrin of Men, who hold the Churches Authority to be meer Human, and yet meerly upon her Authority you receive such and such Copies to be the true Copies of the true Original Word of God? See *Sect. 4. n. 3, 4. &c.* Yea, upon the meer weak Testimony of your own private Translators, all you (who are not exceeding skilful in *Greek*) take your *English* Bible for the Word of God; and again, upon the meer weak Authority of your Ministers, you take that Interpretation for true which they tell you to be so, tho' you cannot know it to be so, for want of skill in Languages, and for want of skill in conferring Places, and for want of Ability to use those Twenty Rules which your own Doctors hold necessary for the knowing assuredly the true Sense of God. Thus I might shew you how in all those Twenty four necessary Points (which I have hitherto shew'd not contain'd in any part of the written Word of God) you hold truly and properly the Doctrin and Precepts of Men, whom you be-

248 *The Bible not containing all points,*
lieve to have meerly Human Authority. Thus you proceed as the Jews and Pharisees did, not relying only upon the Traditions they had from *Moses*; (for example, concerning the Remedy against Original Sin applicable to Female Children:) but relying upon Traditions devis'd by some ill Interpreters of their Law; by *Sammai*, by *Killel*, by *Acbiba*, and such other Rabbins; as *St. Jerom* teaches in several places.

14. Whereas you add, That our Traditions are to be challeng'd of Contrariety to the Scripture for the most part, you proceed in your usual manner to say boldly what is for your turn, but never turn your Hand or Finger to prove it. Doctor, I will undertake to make good at any time, that there is incomparable more difficulty to shew that one part of the written Word is not contrary to some other, than to shew that any one of our Traditions is far from the least contrariety to the Word of God: See *Seet. 23. n. 6.* All Scholars know I speak in this Point that which is evident. Thus I have answer'd your whole twenty third Section.

15. I have now a Word of great importance to say to you and yours. You affirm the Scripture alone to be

ne-

necessarily admitted by us, as our sole and only Judge. In this, your part is affirmative, and so you must prove what you say. In this you contradict all visible Catholic Churches which were in the World at your Reformation: Against so public Authority Evidence of Scripture must be brought, or else you do most injuriously oppose so public an Authority, according to your own Principles. Thirdly, In this you deliver a Point which (if true) is no less necessary than the true Choice of the only Rule directing to true Faith; therefore, according to your own Principles, this Point must be clearly contain'd in Scripture, in which you say all necessary Points are clearly contain'd. But we have now at large heard every Text you thought fit to bring for a thing of so great concernment: The Answers given to every one shew clearly, not any one of them to contain that Point clearly: Whence I conclude, That what in such kind of Matters cannot be prov'd by clear Texts, must not be believ'd, according to your own Principles; therefore, even according to them, we are not to believe that Scripture is by it self alone our sole and only Rule of Faith, or that it clearly contains the plain Decision of *all* necessary Controversies; which it *must* do to be our Judge in *them* all.

250 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

Remember Mr. Doctor how you § 13. tell the Antiprelatical Party that they are bound to bring plain and exprefs Scripture to demonstrate that Episcopacy is unlawful. It were well, more Authority were yielded to Tradition of the Churches of God. And § 14. we thence received Bishops, whence we received the Christian Faith. So you. Say so of all you received, and I need say no more.

Sect. II.

A Fifteenth Argument. Altho' Scripture only should be our Judge, yet this Judge would decide many Points clearly against you.

YOU cannot but give me leave to call that clearly decided against you by Scripture, for which I can bring, at the least, as clear Texts, as you bring for the decision of many necessary Points, which you hold (by reason of such Texts) to be clearly decided by Scripture, as you say all Points are, which be necessary to Salvation. Therefore, if I can bring as clear Texts for some Points of our Faith opposite to yours, as you can bring for those fourteen necessary Points of which I treated in my second Section; and as clear as you can bring for your belief of those divers Points specified in my eighth Sect.

Sect. In which I have particularly Examined all your chief Texts for Baptizing Children: If I also can bring as clear Texts as you could bring in my *Ninth Section*, for the lawfulness of working on Saturdays, and unlawfulness of working on Sundays; or as you could bring in the precedent Section to prove that the Scripture contains, and clearly decides all necessary Controversies: If I can do all this, then these Texts of mine cannot but be allow'd by you to be indeed clear; because you say, you can bring clear Texts for all Points necessary (as all the above mention'd Points be;) but I will shew that the Texts that I shall here bring, for some prime Points in which we believe contrary to you, be at the least as clear as any of those Texts brought by you and affirm'd by you to be very sufficiently clear. Wherefore my Texts, being as clear as those which are acknowledg'd to be sufficiently clear, must also be acknowledg'd to be sufficiently clear. Now then to my Texts.

2. What imports more a dying Christian, than to have his Sins forgiven him; and that upon the Word of God? And yet you cry *Superstition, Superstition, if a Priest be called to pray over him, and to anoint him with Oyl, to procure forgiveness of his Sins.* But what saith your own Bible? Is any
Man

252 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

Man sick among you, let him call for the Elders (the Priests) of the Church, and let them Pray over him, Anointing him with Oyl in the name of the Lord, and the Prayer of the Faithful shall save the sick. And the Lord shall raise him up, and if he has committed Sins they shall be forgiven him. James 5. 14. Have you among all the Texts which you cited, and I examin'd in the last Section, any one Text but half so clear for what you intended to prove, as this Text is to prove *Extreme Unction* to forgive Sins; and consequently to be a Sacrament, or visible Sign (such an one as the act of anointing is) of invisible Grace conferr'd thereby to forgive his Sins: for (saith the Text) *if he be in Sins, they shall be forgiven him.* If you have but any one Text half so clear for that prime Fundamental Point of yours, I pray bring it forth now whilst that and the answer to that is in fresh Memory; That answer will tell you what I have to say against any such Text: Let us see what you can say against this Text? Some answer, that it relates to the Gift of healing in those days; which shitt is directly against the words of the Text, saying, *if he has committed Sins, they shall be forgiven.* Again what Scripture have you to prove that the Elders in the days of St. James cured all infirm men with Anointing them with Oyl? Lastly, I am most earnest to know by what clearer

clearer Text than this, you were forced to forsake the practice of this Sacrament used by all Catholic Churches upon Earth, when you cast it off as Superstitious; Where is, I Pray, your so much boasted-of evidence of Scripture against so Public Authority? Mr. Doctor remember your own words cited in the end of my last Section. Remember that you § 43. say, that *the universal practice of the Church is the best Interpreter of Scripture, where there is no plain Text* (as here there is not) *to take away all gainsaying.*

3. When a little after your first Reformation you (contrary to all the Churches both of East and West) denyed the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament; by what clearer Text could you evidently demonstrate that those following Texts could not be truly interpreted of a Real Presence? *This is my Body: The bread which I will give is my flesh. My flesh is meat indeed, my blood is drink indeed:* Infomuch as *he who eateth or drinketh unworthily is guilty of the Body and Blood of our Lord. This is the Cup of the new Testament, which Cup* (as is evident by the Greek Text, where the Gender agrees only with the Cup) *shall be shed for you:* That then in the Cup was the very same Blood which was shed. Give me, as clear Texts as these are, to prove, that one man may not at the same time have

254 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

have two Wives, or that he may Labor on the Saturday, but not on the Sunday, &c?

4. Again, when you denied the Priest of the Church to have power to forgive Sins, contradicting also herein all the Catholic Churches upon the Earth; what clearer Text did you bring against them all, to prove that they falsely interpreted to their purpose this Text: *He breathed upon them, and said, whose Sins soever ye shall remit, they are remitted: And whose Sins soever ye shall retain, they are retained, Jo. 20. 22.*

Against public Authority you should bring evident demonstration of Scripture, according to your own Principles: We now must earnestly call for this evidence in the three Sacraments here mention'd by me. We call at least, for clearer places than these be, in case you say these be not clear enough to decide the Controversie for us. And we call for such places to decide all those four and Twenty necessary Points which I have mention'd: Which being necessary, must be shewed to be decided rightly by clear Scripture; and consequently by clearer Texts than any of these are; in case you deny these to be sufficiently clear, give us those clearer Texts, and we will confess our selves silenced. If you cannot do this; this little will serve to silence you.

Se&t.

Sect. 12.

A Sixteenth Argument, That the Holy Fathers never allowed the Scripture for the only Rule of Faith.

1. **I**T is most unreasonable to say, that the greatest Doctors of the primitive Church did not know the only Rule of Faith: For this Point importing above all Points, the Apostles must needs (had it been so) have imprinted it deeply in the minds of all they instructed; and all their Disciples would have done the like to their Disciples: So that many of the Church, especially the most Learned of the whole Church, would not be ignorant of this Point: At least I am sure, that you may sooner now be presumed ignorant of the only true Rule of Faith, than they then.

2. First then, had the Holy Fathers ever allowed of the Scripture for the only Rule of Faith, they neither would, nor could have held any men Heretics for holding that which was contrary to no clear Scripture: But they did hold many such to be Heretics, as I have shewed *Sect.* 8. where I shewed that *St. Austin* did hold on the one side, that Baptism of Children could not be proved by clear Scripture; and yet he, in and with the *Milevetan Council*

256 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

Council condemned those for Heretics who did deny the necessity of Baptism for Children. See *Seet. 7. N. 3. 4. 5. 8.* There also *N. 6.* He and *Vincentius Lirinensis* account them Heretics who held rebaptization necessary to all baptized by Heretics: And yet he held on the other side, that this point could not be clear'd out of only *Scripture*; see them *N. 7.* In the next number I did shew how Antiquity held also the *Quarta-decimani* for Heretics, tho' the Believing *Easter* ought to be always kept on the fourteenth day of the Moon be not against clear *Scripture*. There also I shew'd out of *St. Epiphanius*, and also *St. Austin* (who expressly in the beginning of his Catalogue professeth to put down none but such as are true Heretics) that *Aerius* was held by antiquity for an Heretic, *because he denyed Prayer for the dead, and held that there was no fasting days of Precept*: In which Points I am sure you will say that this *Aerius* held nothing contrary to *Scripture*. There also I shew'd out of *St. Epiphanius* and *St. Austin*, that the *Antidicomarites* or *Helvidians* were held Heretics by Antiquity, for denying that our Lady after the Birth of our Savior did ever live a Virgin: Which Point is not clear in *Scripture*. Therefore all those were Heretics, not for contradicting *Scripture*; yet they were Heretics for contradicting

dicting some Rule of Faith: Therefore there is some other Rule of Faith besides Scripture; and consequently Scripture alone is not the only Rule of Faith.

3. Secondly, It was by Holy Fathers noted to be peculiar to Heretics to stand to Scripture only, and to refuse all other Rules: So the Macedonians and Eunomians, having no regard of what was taught to the contrary by the multitude and Antiquity of Christians, deny'd the Holy Ghost to be glorified with the Father and the Son; because the Scripture did no where expressly say this. St. Basil de Sp. Sanc. c. 25. and l. 1. contra Eunom. So the Pelagians (in St. Austin, de Natura & gratia, c. 39.) were us'd to say, Let us believe that which we read, but let us believe it to be a wickedness to believe that which we do not read. So St. Austin, L. 1. against Maximinus the Arian Bishop, brings him in, saying, If thou bring forth any things from those Divine Scriptures which are common to us both, we must needs hear thee. But those speeches which are not in Scripture, be by no means receiv'd by us, seeing that our Lord admonisheth us, and saith, without cause they worship me, teaching the Commandments and Precepts of Men. So he. And just so you, as is clear by your Objection in the last Section but one before this, Num. 13. And again, I wish to be the Disciple

258 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

sciple of Divine Scriptures. Wherefore the Council of Sens in the Seventh Age decreed (Decreto 5.) *That it was a dangerous thing to be in that Error, that nothing is to be admitted which is not drawn from Scripture. For many things are deriv'd by Christ from the hands of the Apostles from Mouth to Mouth, &c. which are to be holden without all doubt. See Sect. 20.*

4. Thirdly, The Holy Fathers expressly refuse to dispute out of Scriptures only, upon this very cause, that they do not suffice to end and decide all Controversies. So the most ancient *Tertullian* speaks first in general, of never disputing with Heretics. C. 17. out of Scriptures only, *Because this Scripture-combat availeth to nothing, but to the making either ones Stomach, or ones Brains to turn, Lib. de Præf. C. 17.* And by and by he in particular saith of the *Gnostics*, that which we may say of our Adversaries, *This Heresie do's not receive some Scriptures, (you put ten Books among the Apocrypha) some Scriptures they receive with additions and detractions ordered to their turn: See what I said of your Translations, Sect. 5. and those Scriptures they receive in any manner intirely, they turn to their turn by new devis'd Expositions, (See how you do this, Sect. 7.)* Then he concludes generally, *We must not therefore appeal to Scriptures, nor in our Combat*

Combat rely upon them, in which either no victory is to be obtain'd, or a very uncertain one. Which, how true it is, you may see in my Scripture-disputation about the keeping of *Sunday*, *Sect.* 9. where I gave you Text for Text, as good as you brought or could bring. Thus the *Anabaptists* do not only weary you out, and shew you to the very Eye; that, standing to Scripture alone, they are invincible by you; but also they sometimes force your prime Doctors to leave their standing on Scripture only, and force them to fly to Tradition. See *Dr. Taylors* plain confession hereof, *Sect.* 1. N. 4. And your great *Beza* found this insisting upon Scripture only to breed such endless jarring, that in his last Book but one, *he professeth himself to be weary of such Combats and Encounters, because he finds Controversies thereby made but brawls; and therefore wishes, that in some Common Assembly of Churches all these strifes at once were decided.* The evidence of this Point made your learn'd *Sutcliff* in his review, P. 42. to say, *It is false that we will admit of no Judge but Scripture; for we appeal still to a lawful General Council.* But here I would ask, how we can rest upon the Sentence given by a General Council, if that be not Infallible; for still every Man must be calling this Sentence to review made by his own weak Judgment, as
has

260 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

has been fully declar'd, *Sect. 1. N. 1, 2, 3, 4.*

5. Some of our Adversaries think to shift off the Authority of *Tertullian*, as if it were deliver'd against those only who rejected great part of the Scriptures, and corrupted other parts; which, say they, we do not. I answer, that of your like proceedings I have spoken enough in the places cited jointly with *Tertullian's* Words: But this your shift is clearly undone by *Tertullian's* own Words following, C. 45. *We now hitherto have in general (mark this word) treated against all Heresies, repelling them (all) upon certain just and necessary exceptions from Conferring out of Scriptures.* So he. Yea the very drift of a great part of this his little Book, is independently of all Scripture, to confute all Heretics, by proving that true Believers must be able to shew by Tradition the descent of their Doctrine from the Apostles. But if, indeed, *Truth stands for us* (saith he, C. 37.) *who-soever we be who walk in that Rule which the Church has receiv'd from Christ, Christ from God, we proceed manifestly in our intent, defining that Heretics ought not to be admitted to make their appeal to Scriptures whom we do prove without the Scriptures, not to have any right to the Scriptures.* Note here first, that he speaks of such *as would appeal to Scriptures*; therefore they did receive them.

them. Note Secondly, *that without Scriptures, Tertullian* promiseth himself the surest Victory, by forcing them to shew their visible Succession, and to shew their Doctrine deliver'd from Hand to Hand by Tradition, or word of Mouth; as that word was *which the Apostles receiv'd from Christ, and Christ from God.* By this Rule he would have us all walk.

6. Our Adversaries use to alledge some passages of Fathers appealing in their Disputes against Heretics unto the Scriptures, chiefly *St. Austin*, who disputing against the *Donatists* conceiv'd himself to have most manifest Texts to prove against them, that *Christ's* true Church could never grow so low, as to be visible only in part of *Africa*; the visibility of *Christ's* Church through the World being manifest in Scripture, as he saith, *de unitate Ecclesiæ*, C. 7, 11, 15, & 17. But it is no good Argument to say, The Fathers appeal'd to the Scriptures in some few Points, in which they knew they had manifest advantages; therefore they approv'd appealing to Scripture only in any kind of Controversie: So it is no Argument to say, The Fathers did exact written Texts of Scripture in proof of some Heretical Novelties, and profess'd they would not give ear to such Novelties without written Texts; therefore we must

262 *The Bible is not our Judge.*

must not admit of any, tho' never so ancient belief of the whole Church, deliver'd by Tradition from the Apostles, without some clear written Text can be alledg'd for it. This is no consequence; for in Points which are known not to be deliver'd by Tradition, yea, not so much as pretending to it, is a good Argument to say, Give me a clear Text for this, or else with the same facility that you affirm it, I will deny it; as I said *Sect. 10. N. 9, 10.* Do but note what I said there, and then joyn it to these places, and all places alledgable out of the Fathers will easily be solved.

7. All those Fathers which might be alledg'd (and part of them is alledg'd *Sect. 8.*) for holding Traditions in Points necessary to Salvation, no where express'd in Scripture; as also all those who hold the Authority of the Church by it self to suffice to ground our Faith, and to determin all our Controversies (whom we shall cite *Sect. 21.*) all these, I say, clearly hold, that Scripture is not the only Rule, Guide and Direction of all that is necessary to be believ'd, or done by us for obtaining Salvation.

QUEST.

QUEST. III.

Whether the Church be the Judge appointed by God to end all our Controversies? With a word of the Socinians concerning Reason being our Judge.

1. **S**OME Men may perhaps wonder why, in so short a work, I should be so long in proving the Scripture not to be, by it self alone, our only Rule, or direction of Faith; but those who are understanding Scholars will easily see, how, after the proof of that Point, I have in a manner dispatched all this business; Because all Sectaries, making their standing to the sole Judgment of Scripture, to be the only Foundation of all and every one of their so several Sects; when now this Foundation is shewed not to serve the end they intend, but that we must yet have a Judge giving us infallible assurance of many necessary verities of which the Scripture alone do's not assure us; hence follows manifestly the utter overthrow of all these and all other imaginable Sects, by the apparent Necessity of holding the true Church of *Christ* to be this Judge, the only being the Judge, to which we
are

264 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

are sent by Scripture it self, with an obligation of our being held for Publicans or Heathens unless we hear her. Neither is there any kind of probability now left of finding any other Judge sufficient to direct us in all things necessary to Salvation, and to end all our Controversies, and sufficient to contain us all in unity of one interior Faith, and exterior profession of the same, with all other conditions requisite in our Judge.

2. Human Reason, so adored by the *Socinians*, cannot be this Judge: *First*, because fallible; but with this they easily dispense, denying any Faith to be infallible. *Secondly*, No one Parish in the World was ever yet known to be of this their opinion, is it then likely to be true in the Eyes of any rational Man? What wit is there in thinking to be wiser than all wits? What Reason to make Reason Judge in things known to surpass Reason? *Thirdly*, Do's not reason perswade any Man to think that it is fitter for him to submit to the Authority of all the Christians of all Ages, and places, who ever had any thing like a Church, than to adhere to a few scatter'd self-conceited People, pretending to find out a wiser ground of Religion, than ever was acknowledged by any kind of People in the World, who had the shape of any
Univer-

The Church is our infallible Judge. 265

Universal and perpetual Church? of which more *Sect. 14.* *Fourthly*, How imprudently did the Apostle exhort all *Idem* *sapere, to be of one opinion, to keep unity in Faith, To speak one thing, to be perfect in one Sense, and one Judgment, 1 Cor. 1. and 2 Cor. 13.* if he knew it were Gods Will that every one should follow his own judgment, which every one has as different almost from another, as their Faces are? *Fifthly*, What an impropportionable means is this to keep that unity in Faith, and to adhere to what has been Evangelized or delivered unto us, tho an Angel should come to perswade the contrary? For let but an abler Man than my self come, and shew me, that I have not so good reason for what I believe as he has, and as he (if we stand only to reason without respect to Authority) can bring to the contrary; I must (say they) follow what he proposeth: So that weak Men must be Weather-cocks. *Sixtly*, Is it not all reason, that what convincing motives make evidently credible to be revealed by God, that I should credit that not as the word of Man, but receive it as the word of God, as truly it is, and so rely upon it as strongly as is fit to rely on the word of God? *Seventhly*, according to this unreasonable Ground, there must be allowed, all the World over, as great variety of believing more or less,

266 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

as there is of understanding more or less: and as great Contrariety of belief must be lawful, as there is contrariety in the Judgments of one to another, and of the same man in different occasions. Can any creature, who is but like a rational Man, believe that the World was taught to proceed so by *Christ*, and his Apostles, or that the World did ever proceed so in any one Age? What record testifieth any such thing? Is this to *bring into Captivity all understandings to the Obedience of Christ?* 2 Cor. 10. 5. If this wild Liberty be called Captivity; I am sure that, by as good a figure, you *Socinians* (who call your selves Rational men) may as truly be called the most Irrational of all Christian men. You needs must pardon me if I Judge so, for your own Principle, of following what my own Reason tells me, makes me most really to think so, after mature consideration of the matter.

Sect.

SECT. 13.

*It is declar'd what we understand when we seek,
whether the Church is to be our Judge or no?*

1. **I**T must still be carried in our minds, that we are in search of the Judge appointed us by *Christ*; and consequently we must proceed as Men do, who first seek after a general knowledge in gross, and then descend to particulars. So first we searched whether God had given us any Judge; then finding that he has given us some infallible direction, we did see whether this were given sufficiently in any one Book of Scripture, or in any particular Number of Books, or in the whole Canon taken together. But we, not finding as yet what we sought, we cast an Eye upon Natural Reason, which if it were to be follow'd by us as our Judge, this very Judge of ours (that is our own Reason) told us she neither was, nor appear'd like to that Judge we sought for, she being a Judge not ending, but endlessly raising doubts in all points; still therefore we are in our general search. And we have only in gross got a hint of finding some infallible means, to guide us se-

268 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

curely in all our doubts, in that blessed Congregation of People which follow'd the instructions of *Christ*, and his Disciples, still propagating the Doctrin deliver'd to them from Age to Age until we come to our Age. Here, or no where, this infallible direction is to be had. But by what particular way this Congregation is to communicate, and impart this direction unto us, is not the thing we now seek at the first; but it is the very last thing we can seek for. For that being found, we are to follow that particular means, and by no means to stray one foot from it. We must seek that we may find, and after we have once found what we sought for, we must stand still firmly fixed in the Faith we have found. Because by what we have found we are also taught to believe this particular, that we are to rest free from further inquiry; because our God would not have us follow any other Judges than he appoints; therefore he would have us seek after no other, but believe that no other was to be sought after, lest so we should be always seekers and never be Believers; as *Tertullian* discourseth admirably, *c. 7. de Præscript.*

The Church is our infallible Judge. 269

2. We do not therefore as yet search whether this particular means of directing us, be by the Decrees of the chief Pastor of this Church; or by the Counsels held without him, or held by him and defining together with him; for this search is yet a further work, tho' it be a work soon dispatched, for as much as concerns our purpose, after that we have once assuredly found out that this infallible means is to be found in this blessed Congregation instituted by his Disciples, and their followers with a visible succession in all Ages from *Christ's* Age to this. Now then, this one thing we search for, is whether this blessed Congregation (which we always understand here, when we name the Church, as long as we speak of searching our Guide or Judge in a more general manner) has not some means or other appointed by God, by which she can infallibly guide us to the knowledge of the true Faith? When we have found that she has some such means; we shall readily pass on further, to see what means this is. Now let us be sure not to intangle our selves with that further Search, or any thing belonging to it; until we have fully satisfied our selves of this general verity *that this blessed Congregation has in it some means appointed by God, to*

270 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

direct all to the knowledge of the only true Faith. Neither yet do we begin to search, whether this Congregation, instituted thus by *Christ*, and still visibly continuing in his Doctrin, be the Church of *Rome*, or the Protestant Church, or both these, or any other besides these, of which hereafter : but that one thing for which now we only search is, whether this Congregation (wheresoever it is) has not some infallible Means appointed by God, to be follow'd by all, that all may come to be sav'd in it ?

3. And we most groundedly say, that this Church (still meaning by this Name the Congregation we speak of) is our Infallible Judge : and consequently, this Judge has some Infallible Means to guide all to the Truth in all Points of Faith, tho' not expressly contain'd in Scriptures, and to decide all our Controversies in Religion ; for which I shall give my Reasons in the ensuing Section. But before I begin it, I note in a word, That this Church, having some Infallible Means appointed by God to direct us in the only true Faith, (without which Faith eternal Salvation cannot be had) it must be a damnable Sin not to take pains, in a tolerable manner, to find it out, and to embrace it when we have found it : for otherwise we should neglect the execution,

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 271

tion of what God has appointed us to do, in a Matter necessary to our Salvation; and we should also sin against that Charity which every one owes to his own Soul, if, having Means offer'd us, to be infallibly guided in the choice of that Faith necessary to Salvation, we should neither take ordinary pains to find it, nor to follow it when we had found it. This Lesson is so very necessary to many thousands, that it deserves to be a thousand times over inculcated unto them.

Sect. 14.

It is prov'd out of the Old Testament; That the Church is our Infallible Judge in all Controversies of Faith.

1. **F**OR more than two thousand years before any Word of the Old Testament was written, Gods Church had some infallible way to end all Controversies; for all that time there was no Scripture, and yet there were many Points then necessary to be believ'd, in which Men of various Judgments might vary in their Judgments: For example, about the Belief of reward, and punishment of the life to come; about the Immortality of the Soul; about the Fall of Adam; the promise of a Redeemer, and

272 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

afterwards of this Redeemers being to be the Son of *Abraham*; about the necessity of the Circumcision given unto him, &c. The Church of that time was the only Judge of all these, and such like Controversies: And as they, who oppos'd her known Tradition, were accounted Misbelievers; so those who believ'd them, are declar'd by St. Paul to have had *the same Spirit of Faith* that we, 2 Cor. 4. 13. Shall not then *Christs Church* be as much enabled by God to pass an Infallible Decision, of what is to be held now by us in point of Faith? The like Argument holds strong in the Jewish Church, which, from the time of *Moses*, to the time of *Christ*, had some infallible means, besides Scripture to end all Controversies, as appears by Deut. 7. 8. Where those words, *And they shall shew the Sentence of Judgment, and thou shalt do according to it, &c.* And those other words, *The Man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken to the Priest, even that Man shall die*: Clearly intimate the infallibility of this Judges Sentence. For God would never oblige all to follow an erring Judgment, which defines often Lies for Truth; and oblige all to imbrace those Lies under pain of Death. Secondly, The Refusers to embrace a Lie do not do *presumptuously*, as God says those

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 273.

those do, who will not hearken to the Priests: He therefore ever says the Truth. Thirdly, according to the true translated Bibles, it is said in the ninth Verse, of the Priest, *Who shall shew thee the truth of the Judgment.* Which words prove, that God would assist in declaring always the Truth. Fourthly, It had been a most unjust Murther to put a Man to death for not following that which might well be a Lie: God would never have enacted such a Law. Fifthly, *Ioseph the Jew L. 2. contra Apion.* testifies their *High Priests to have been their Judges of Controversies.* And *Dr. Whitaker, de Sacra Scrip. Pag. 466.* acknowledging as much, says, *It was not lawful to appeal, for otherwise there would have been no end of contention.* Shall *Christs Church*, which is the Mistress and Lady, want that which the Jewish had, she being but the Handmaid?

2. Before I come to the Texts, which speak particularly of *Christs Church*, I appeal to any sober Judgment, who shall ponder them with due reflection, to judge whether they be not, to the very full as clear to prove my intent, as any of those which any of our Adversaries can bring, for any one of those twenty four necessary Points, which I have heretofore shew'd to be clearly set

274 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

down in no Scripture, tho' they affirm them all to have clear Texts of Scripture for them? Whence again, I ask, how you can deny these my Texts to be clear, which are in any sober Judgment as clear, as those which you all hold (and must hold) to be clear? And particularly, I wish the Texts I am now going to cite, were equally ballanc'd with those Texts which Dr. *Fern* and others cite, to prove that Scripture is our only Judge; for so my Reader (if he will but please to turn to those Texts *Seet. 10.*) may soon see whether, even according to the Judgment of Scripture, (their own only Judge) the Church be no better prov'd to be our Judge, than the Scripture alone is prov'd to be so. And I desire all to note, how unjustly we are dealt withal, who being advantag'd by the peaceable possession of all public Ecclesiastical Authority, which any Catholic Church had in the World, at that time in which you began your Reformation (all which Authority stood for the Churches being the Infallible Judge;) and yet no evidence of Scripture half so good, being brought against this our Authority, as we can bring for it; we, notwithstanding were dispossest'd of it, and condemn'd of the most unjust usurpation that ever was, by those who hold, that against Public Authority
evident

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 275

evident demonstration of Scripture must be brought. Examine the Texts I shall bring, and then examine your weak Evidences brought in my Tenth Section.

3. Again, before I cite these Texts, I must needs desire my Reader to carry along with him in his Mind one Note more, which is this; that all these Texts speak still of a Church always teaching Truth in all Points which she proposes to be believ'd, and not in some certain Points only. This I desire much to be noted, because our Adversaries only acknowledge, that by these Texts the Church is secur'd from erring fundamentally, *To the subversion of Saving Faith*; as Dr. Fern acknowledges *Sect. 20*. This confession of theirs undoeth all Religion; because the Texts I am going to alledge speak as universally, and as far from all limitation of the Churches being by God secur'd from all kind of Error, fundamental, or not fundamental, as any Texts speak of the Apostles or Prophets being secur'd from all kind of Error fundamental, or not fundamental: And you by limiting these Texts to the only securing of the Church from only fundamental Errors, do teach others in like manner to limit those Texts by which the Prophets, or Apostles are said to be secur'd from Error, to only such a security, as

276 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

secures them from fundamental Errors only; which would be a most damnable Doctrine: For, thence would follow, that the fundamental Points being very few, (as you say) all that is written, or said by the Apostles, or Prophets, which concerns not those few fundamental Points might be false, as being deliver'd by Men not secur'd from Error in any Points not fundamental. For my part, I take the most fundamental Point of Faith to be this, That there is a God speaking infallible Truth in all that he says, by what Instrument soever any one of his Sayings, in any matter (whatsoever it be) is propos'd by him; whether this Instrument be the Church, as it was for the first two thousand years of the World, or the Prophets, or Apostles rais'd up in his Church. And now let us proceed on to our Text.

4. *My first Text is out of Isa. 2. v. 2. 3. And it shall come to pass in the last days (so the Apostles call'd the time of the New Law) that the Mountains of the Lords House shall be establish'd in the top of Mountains (behold its great visibility, so that) All Nations shall flow unto it (behold its vast extent) and say (with joy) Come ye and let us go up to the Mountain of the Lord, to the House of the God of Jacob; and He (note this word He) will teach us his ways (in this House*

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 277

House or Church,) *For out of Sion shall go forth the Law* (as it did by the Apostles on *Whis-Sunday*;) *and the word of God from Jerusalem* (from whence the Churches first Preachers began the divulging of their Doctrin :) *And he shall judge among the Nations*, (not in his Person, for *Christ* went not out of *Jury*; but *he shall judge among the Nations*) by his Churches tribunal erected among all Nations, so conspicuously, that they all may flow to it: Will any Man say, His Judgment is fallible? In this Tribunal it is *he who teacheth us his ways*; dare you say that *he teacheth us Errors*? Is any Error, (tho' not fundamental) *his way*? *Christ* then, erecting a Church visible to the whole World, that the whole World might resort with joy unto it for necessary instruction; and intending himself to instruct them by it, and by it to judge among all Nations; had not complied with this intention of his, if he had not secur'd that Church from all Error, by which *he himself teacheth all the World his ways*, and not superstitious Errors. And had this his Church been liable to pass false Judgment in deciding Controversies about *Faith*; the disgrace had redounded to God, who authoriz'd that Tribunal, to be that very Court in which, to the joy of all, *He judgeth among all Nations*.

5. *My Second Text* is out of the same Prophet

278 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

Prophet C. 35. promising to us, that the coming of *Christ*, *a way so direct* (not only in it self) but so direct *unto us*, that *Fools cannot err by it*. Is it not then infallible? But of this Text I say no more here, because I have ponder'd it already in the very Preface, Num. 3. I only note, that this way being so direct to us all, must needs be only in such a Church, as is of a vast extent, and so visible every where in all Ages, that all Men of all places might be in all Ages directed by it, and so directed, as not to err; *For Fools cannot err by it*. What more infallible in order to us?

6. *My Third Text* is out of the same Prophet, C. 54. where first mention is made most gloriously of the vast extent of *Christ's* visible Church; *Sing O barren, &c. Enlarge the place of thy Tent, and let them stretch forth the Curtains of thy Habitations. Spare not, lengthen thy Cords, and strengthen thy Stakes. For thou shalt break forth on the right-hand and on the left, and thy Seed shall inherit the Gentiles. As I have sworn, that the Waters of Noah should no more go over the Earth, so I have sworn, that I would not be wroth with thee (as I am with all who admit superstitious and foul Errors to reign over them.) Every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. The Tongues of all Heretics are Tongues that rise against the Church,*

in

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 279

in judging contrary to her definitions in matters of Faith; but fear not (O Church of God) for every Tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn: Yea, their very rising in opposition of Judgment unto thee, is their condemnation; because, hence appears, that the Church differs in Judgment from them, which is enough (in the Opinion of St. *Austin*) to make us hold them Heretics; for just in the end of his Catalogue or Book of Heresies he says, *It is superfluous to set down what the Church (in particular) has defin'd against them all; but (says he) Scire suffieiat eam contra ista sentire, Let it suffice (for their condemnation of Heresie) that she is contrary in her Judgment to them all.* And therefore it is not lawful to hold any one of them. See Sect. 21. N. 4.

7. *My Fourth Text* is out of the same Prophet, Cap. 59. v. 20, 21. which Text (*Rom. 11. v. 26.*) St. Paul interprets to be spoken of the Church of *Christ*, to which, after his coming, many of the Jews were to unite themselves being to be Baptiz'd in it, Instructed in it, Govern'd by it, and consequently the Text speaks of such a Visible Church, as that must needs be, to whom the Jews converted could unite themselves to be by it Baptiz'd, Instructed, Govern'd. To this Visible Church
thus

280 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

thus says our Lord, *As for me this is my Covenant with them, says our Lord: My Spirit (free from all Error) that is upon thee and my words (free from Error great or little) which I have put in thy Mouth, (that Mouth by which visibly she do's teach my ways to all Nations that flow unto thee, that Mouth by which I judge among all Nations, that Mouth which shall condemn every Tongue that shall rise against it in Judgment) My words (I say) which I have put in (this) thy Mouth, shall not depart out of thy Mouth (thus visibly teaching, judging, &c.) nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed; nor out of the Mouth of thy Seeds Seed; says the Lord, from hence forth and for ever.* Behold here the Spirit of Truth intailed upon the Church visible, and Gods words put in her Mouth, by which she teaches all Nations in her First Age; and in the Mouth of her Seed, by which she teaches all Nations in the Second Age; and in the Mouth of her Seeds Seed from thence forth and for ever, by which she teaches all Nations in the Third Age, and in every other Age thence forth following, to the end of the World. Find me then an Age, in which this everlasting Visible Church shall teach any Error, tho' never so little? If you can do this, then in that Age his Covenant was made void.

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 281

8. *My Fifth Text* shall be out of the very next Chapter (to wit, *Isa. 60. v. 10.*) in which God by the Prophet triumphs in the vast extent and glory of his Church visible, *The Sons of strangers shall build up thy Walls, and their Kings shall Minister unto thee, thy Gates shall be open continually* (A poor Glory if they admit in Idolatry, Superstition, &c.) *they shall not be shut Day nor Night, that Man may bring unto thee the Forces of the Gentiles, and that their Kings may be brought* (securely from all Error to be instructed by thee :) *For the Nation and Kingdom which will not serve thee, shall perish.* The Sense of which last words is clearly this; What Nation soever refuses to serve the Church, by not submitting to her Doctrine, shall perish, not Temporally in this World, in which they often flourish; but Eternally in the next. It is therefore damnable not to submit to the Doctrine of some Church which is visible at all times, and known to all Nations; for it could never be damnable not to submit to an Invisible Church; there must then ever be some Visible Church on Earth, which all Nations under pain of Damnation are to serve; and to which God may truly say, *The Nation and Kingdom that will not serve thee, shall perish.* Now tell me, I pray, when this English Nation, by a National Synod
(as

282 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

(as they call it) acknowledg'd no visible Church which this Nation was bound to serve, but decreed many things contrary to all the visible Churches; How escap'd they this Sentence of Damnation? I confess Nations should do well, and should further their Salvation, in refusing to serve all Churches then visible, if all those Churches did both Err, and also father their Lies upon God the Father of Truth, venting their own Errors for Divine Verities: But, I say, it is impossible that all the visible Churches in the whole World should in any Age come to this pass; For in every Age it must be true, that *The Nation and Kingdom which will not serve thee, shall perish.* But you will say perhaps, for these Ten or Twelve Ages her Errors have Eclipsed her. Read then the following Verses, *I will make thee an Everlasting Excellency*; (an excellent Church indeed, which fathers her Lies and Superstitions upon God himself.) It follows, but should not follow, if this were true, *And thou shalt suck the breasts of Kings, &c.* yea, *Thy Sun shall no more go down, neither shall the Moon withdraw it self; but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light*: How an everlasting Light? an everlasting Excellency, which ended with an Eclipse of some Thirteen hundred Years, if she failed with the Third Age,

The Church is our infallible Judge. 283

Age, as Dr. Hammond and others please to say? which Third Age was before *she succeed the breasts of Kings*, whence appears the falsity of their Assertion. Again, how do's it follow, *The days of thy Mourning shall be ended?* when you make her to have so sad a time of Mourning as Thirteen hundred, or (at the least) a Thousand Years, under the yoke of Popery? How truly then do's God in the next Chapter v. 7. promise her Sons, *That an everlasting Joy shall be unto them*: Whereas the days of Popery are acknowledg'd to have cover'd the Face of all Christendom four times as long as the day of her true Joy? How then also is it said to her in the end of the next Chapter following, *Thou shalt be called a City sought for, and not forsaken*; if all this while she were the Woman fled into the desert? Away, away with these false Glosses; these words of *Isaiah* must needs be understood of a visible Church, which was not only sought for, but also inhabited, *and not forsaken*, nor left forlorn, nor made abandoned by Idolatry, Superstition, &c. and Errors intollerable, as Dr. Fern calls those of the Church, *Sect. 19.*

9. *My Sixth Text* (for I will count all the many Texts, in the last number, but for one, which might be urged severally, all having great force) shall be out.

284 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

out of the Prophet *Daniel*, C. 2. v. 44. *In the days of those Kingdoms, the God of Heaven shall raise up a Kingdom, which shall not be dispersed, and his Kingdom shall not be deliver'd to another people.* And then to signify the vast extent, the manifest Visibleness, and Perpetuity of this Kingdom (which is his Church, founded by Christ) it follows, *And it shall break in pieces and consume all these (Idolatrous) Kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.* Behold, here God promising the Kingdom rais'd by him, that Kingdom of his only true Church, which visibly has by its Doctrine broke in pieces all Idolatrous Kingdoms of the known World, and is so well secur'd of Gods assistance, to preserve it in quality of a Kingdom, that, even in this quality, it shall always continue, *and stand for ever a glorious visible Kingdom.* And thus literally is fulfil'd that, *Luke 1. 33. And he shall Reign in the House of Jacob for ever.* Whence I argue thus; No Church fallen into Heresie, Schism, Idolatry, Superstition, yea no Church fallen so deep towards Hell, as to father gross, and intollerable Errors upon God, delivering them as Divine Verities, can be said to be Gods Kingdom; or (being so foully fallen) to be his *standing Kingdom*, or permitting gross Errors to Reign in quality of Divine Verities,

The Church is our infallible Judge. 285

to be *the house of Jacob*, in which he Reigns *for ever*; therefore to verifie these Texts of Scripture, there must be found some ever-visible Church upon Earth, a Church flourishing in quality of his standing Kingdom, not fallen into such Errors as you say did reign, but a Church where *he*, and not any *Error may reign*. This Kingdom, so secur'd from Error, is that which I call *Christs* visible, perpetual, and infallible Church, *The House of our Lord established* (so as to stand visibly for ever) *in the top of all Mountains, and all Nations shall flow unto it, and say, come, and let us go up to the Mountain of our Lord, and to the House of the God of Jacob, in which he shall Reign for ever, and he will teach us his ways,* and not gross Errors of Superstition, Idolatry, and there *he shall Judge among the Nations*, even *He* who cannot give a false Judgment, and consequently infallible is his Tribunal erected here in his Church, to send forth his Decrees, by which he Governs, and Reigns. If Error be President in this his Tribunal, Error should Reign, and not *He*: I pray mark how fitly all the above cited Texts agree with this Interpretation, and how harmonically they explicate and confirm one another.

286 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

10. It is also a thing most remarkable how, at the very first attentive reading of these Text, all these new upstart Sects (and Socinianism as well as the rest, yea and so much the sooner, because it never flourished in one whole Parish,) how, I say, all these new upstart Sects, presently appear to be so exceedingly unlike to Gods only true Church, which is foretold to be of so vast extent, so glorious for the Multitude, and magnificent of her Professors, *as Kings*, yea *all Kings*, Princes, and chief Potentates of the Earth, so conspicuously visible in all Ages, and Places, that there is no tolerable Interpretation to be thought of, by which these and such like Texts can be applied to any one of these Congregations? Take Protestantism, and allow it to contain all these new fangled Sects; and yet all the professors of it will not make the Thirtieth part of Christendom, altho' Christendom be but the Fifth part of the World. But take Protestantism as it was for some Twelve hundred years before *Luther*, and so downward, in every one of those Twelve Ages to *Luther*; and you will not find it to be the Ten thousand part of the World, even by its own account: Yea by true account it will be found not to have had one Parish any where. How then do such kind
of

The Church is our infallible Judge. 287

of Religions agree to these Descriptions of the true Church in the Scripture? especially if to the former places you add divers others of the same nature, as that *Isa. 49.* (which *S. Paul Act. 13.* interprets of the Church) *It is a light thing that thou should be my Servant to raise up (only) the Tribes of Jacob; I will also give thee, for a light to Gentiles, that thou mayst be my Salvation unto the end of the Earth. Kings shall see, and arise; Princes also shall Worship. Behold, these shall come from far, and loe these from the North, and from the West, and these from the Land Sinam. Sing O Heaven, and be joyful O Earth, The Children which thou shalt have, shall say again, The place is too strait for me: Give place to me that I may dwell; Kings shall be thy Nursing-Fathers, and Queens thy Nursing-Mothers (They shall not be thy Heads, or Governors, but) They shall bow down to thee with their Faces towards the Earth, and lick up the dust of thy Feet (prostrating themselves to kiss the Feet of thy Supream Pastor) Tell me now, of what Church speaks this Prophet? where was it? Read also this next Chapter; Kings shall walk in the brightness of thy rising. Their Kings shall Minister unto thee, and not Rule over thee, as thy chief Governors. And yet much more, C. 62. particularly, All Kings shall see thy noble one, with that other Eloquent Expression*
on

288 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

on of the Churches visible gloriousness, *Pass ye, pass ye through the Gates, and prepare a way for the People, and make the Journey plain, and pick up the Stones, and lift up the Sign to the People. Behold our Lord will make heard to the end of the Earth.* For, as David said, Ps. 21. v. 28. *All the ends of the Earth shall remember, and be Converted to our Lord, and all the Families of the Gentiles shall Adore in his sight.* And *Malachy. 1. 11.* *From the Rising of the Sun, even to the going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and every where Incense shall be offered to my Name (as it is in the Roman Church) and a pure offering (of Christs pure Body.)*

11. These and divers such like Passages be so clear of the vast Extent, Majesty, and Glory of the Church, with its perpetuity in all Ages, that divers of our Adversaries, not finding any Church upon Earth, but the *Roman*, to which they could be applyed, and perswading themselves that the *Roman Church* was false; became so wicked, as to deny all Christian Religion, because they could not see their own Scriptures verified in it, as it is most fully shewed in the *Protestants Apology*, Tract. 2. C. 1. S. 5. There you shall see how this Consideration made that famous Protestant *David George*, to Preach against Christ and his Apostles. This made your Chief Pastor of *Heidelberg*,

The Church is our infallible Judge. 289

bourg, Adam Nauferus to turn Turk. This made your Alemanus to turn Jew, having been a great Disciple of your great Beza, with a multitude of others here in England, cited by the above-named Author. Now I conclude, that Christianity cannot be maintain'd without such a Church, as is here describ'd, to be found somewhere on Earth; which Church cannot be found, if the Roman Church be such a Church as you make her. But whether she be Christs only true Church, and our Judge, we shall see hereafter. Now I go on.

Sect. 15.

It is proved out of the New Testament, that the Church is our infallible Judge in all Controversies of Faith.

I. **T**O my six Texts out of the Old Scripture, I add six more out of the New. My seventh Text then is, *Mat. 16. 19. Upon this Rock I will build my Church* (that Church which *Christ* foretold by the Prophets, to be of so vast Extent, so visible in all Ages to the end of the World) *and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.* Of this Text Dr. Fern treats in his whole twentieth Section. The substance is, that the *Roman Church* is but part of the *Catholic Church*; and so, tho' the

O

Gates

290 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

Gates of Hell had prevail'd against her, yet they had not prevail'd against the Catholic Church. Yet says he, *We acknowledge that Hell Gates did not prevail against the Church of Rome, to a Subversion of the Faith in it, or a total infection of the Members of it, with all the Errors and Superstitions that prevail'd in it.*

2. Altho' it be not to my purpose (as long as I continue still in a General Search after some infallible Church) to pass to that particular Inquiry, whether this Church be the *Roman* or no (of which afterward); yet because this prime Objection may be best solved in this place; I Answer, that neither Dr. *Fern*, nor any other Doctor, can find out upon Earth, such a Church, different from the *Roman*, as has been promis'd in the Texts of the former Chapter, to which all Nations were to flow, to which Kings and Princes were to Minister, whose Gates should be open night and day, whose Sun should never set, &c. For by the *Roman* Church, we do not understand the particular Diocess of *Rome*; but we understand all such Churches as are joyn'd in Communion to the *Roman*, as Members to their Head. Had Hell Gates prevail'd against all such Churches, where (I pray) had there upon Earth been found any one single Church, against which Church, Hell had

The Church is our infallible Judge. 291

had not more prevail'd, than against the *Roman*? Name but one, and I am satisfied. But that one must be shewed to have been perpetually conspicuous, to which all Nations might flow, having Kings and Potentates of the Earth, Ministers unto her; in so much, that the Nations which would not serve her (as the Nations joyn'd to the *Roman* Communion would not) should perish. That Church must have these and such other Qualities, expressed by Scripture in my precedent Section. Knowing you could not find any Church upon Earth so Qualified, but the *Roman*, which taken (as we usually take it) comprehends the Churches of all Nations joyn'd in Communion unto her, you are forced so to qualifie your Censure of her Errors prevailing in her, that you say, *They prevailed not to a total infection of the Members of it, with all the Errors and Superstitions that prevailed in it.* How come you to know this, if it be not upon Record, that some considerable quantity of Men in all Ages (sufficient to constitute such a Church, as we have seen *Christ's* true Church must be) did not assent to all that was defin'd by the *Roman Church*, nor to other Errors as great as hers, but kept themselves to that which you call the pure *Doctrin of Christ*: If this be not upon Record (as I was saying) then you say you

292 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

know not what: If it be upon Record, begin to tell me who these Men were, in that second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth Age after Popery, against whom, these Errors prevailed not; and I will trouble you with no further Examination of your Records. You can as well eat a whole Mill-stone to breakfast, as prove any such thing by any Records.

5. But you say the Fathers interpreted this promise, *of the Gates of Hell not prevailing against the Church*, of the not failing of the Church, and never of the not Erring of it. Those who object this, mark not that the *Chief way* of failing, is to fail by Erring. How did the Church fail in the Dominions of the *Arians*, was it not by Erring? And so of all Dominions corrupted by Heresie. So also the whole visible Church had failed, if the whole visible Church had proposed any Error to be believed for a Point of Faith; for to do this, is to propose a Lie, as upheld by Divine Authority; which is to fall no less foully, than he should fall, who should teach God to be an affirmer and confirmer of Lies. For whatsoever Point any Church held as a Point of their Faith, they held it as a Divine Verity, affirmed and revealed by God: Therefore if in any Age, the Visible Church held any Error for a Point of Faith, it did fail
most

The Church is our infallible Judge. 293

most miserably: And yet your Protestant Doctors generally teach, that the only Visible Church, did teach several Errors as Points of Faith. So Dr. *Fern* accuseth, even the Primitive Church, of teaching the Millenary Belief, and Infants Communion, tho' most falsely; as our Doctors often have shewed: Thus they throw dirt upon Christs unspotted Spouse. And as the black *Ethiopians* Painted their Gods black; So your foully erroneous Church would have all Churches to have been foully erroneous; as you would have, even the purest Church to have been, had she propos'd these two gross Errors for Divine Verities, as you say she did.

7. Yet to make a shew of something like a Church, Dr. *Fern* says, *The Gates of Hell may prevail; not to the overthrowing of the Fundamental saving Faith; but to Superstruction of Hay, Stubble and worse, I mean Errors in Belief and Practise; Yet such as may still be convinced by the Doctrin of saving Faith, still preserved in the Church.* With these Superstructions, you charge the Roman Church; yet adding, *That she has the Fundamental Faith in express terms, deliver'd down in her, and such saving Knowledge as was sufficient to discern the Foundation from the Superstructures.* All this is confidently said by you; but still (like your

294 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

Self) you end the matter, and offer no kind of Proof: Neither do you add any one Syllable to satisfy the great difficulties which occur in this confident assertion, against which I have something to say; First, to assume such Liberty to our private selves, of Limiting that which the Holy Ghost thought not fit to limit; is to teach others to limit such Texts as promise Divine Assistance to Scripture Writers, and to the Apostles, so, as to say in like manner, that they shall deliver nothing against the Fundamental saving Faith, but yet, that they may super-add a vast multitude of their own private fancies. Secondly, You cannot name a perpetual Visible Church, which Christ had upon Earth, against which, this Error (for so you call it) did not prevail of admitting for an infallible Truth, whatsoever was propos'd by the Church. Of this Error (if it be one) you can Assign no beginning in the *Roman* Church (nor in any other Catholic Church). But this Error is a Fundamental Error, not only because it lays the Foundation, upon which, infinite Errors must be built; but chiefly, because it admits of no other Ground, upon which to found any Divine Faith; For it admits of Scripture it self upon this only Ground, See *Sect. 20. N. 5.* If this Ground be an Error, the Founda-

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 295

Foundation of all the Faith that is in the *Roman Church*, is an Error, and an Error Fundamental, as properly as you can prove any Error to be fundamental: For it makes the Foundation of all our Faith to be an Error. Have you as good ground to say (as you do *Sect. 6.*) The *Arian* Heresie is an Error directly fundamental? Wherefore you must needs say, that the Gates of Hell prevail'd against the *Roman Church* to the overthrow of fundamental saving Faith. And then you will never be able to find *Christ* a true visible Church, by which you receiv'd your Doctrin, your Mission, your Ordination, your Succession from the Apostles; for these you had not from the Greek Church. *Thirdly*, As I just now urg'd, every Church, to which you dare affirm the name of Catholic to have agreed, did teach all the Articles she propos'd to be believ'd as Divine Verities reveal'd by God; even the Greek Church did this. But now, as it is damnable, even in matters of smallest importance, to affirm with an Oath any Lie (because we should take God for a Witness and assertor of our Lie;) so it is a most damnable thing to all those Churches, to propose Errors even in matters of smallest importance for Articles of their Faith, to be believ'd as Di-

296 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

vine Verities, reveal'd, and affirm'd, and confirm'd by God. If the *Roman Church*, as well as all the rest, did this (as you must say she did) she was no Church, but a Synagogue of Satan, because she propos'd Lies to be believ'd equally to Divine Verities, and thus did make the Spirit of Truth, to be the Father of her Lies: Wherefore you must needs say, the Gates of Hell prevail'd against her sufficiently, to bring her (and those who follow'd her Doctrin) to Hell. But when, not only the *Roman*, but also all other Churches for the last thousand years did this, where will you find *Christ* such a Church as Scriptures promise? From which Church you did receive your Doctrin, your Mission, your Ordination, your Succession to the Apostles. *Fourthly*, Neither you, nor any of yours, can tell (with any certainty) which be those particular Points by the belief of which the saving Faith is preserv'd, so that, if all those Points be held, this Faith is held intirely; if they be not all held, she is lost. How blindly then do you proceed, when you affirm, *That the Gates of Hell prevail'd not to the overthrow of fundamental saving Faith*; which is more than you can know, unless you can tell in the Belief of which particular Points this fundamental Faith consists? Do you think

The Church is our infallible Judge. 297

think this was done by preserving still in her such knowledge as was sufficient to discern the Foundation from the Superstructure? If this be enough, then *Arianism*, or any other Heresie, preserving the Scriptures, and not having sufficient force to abolish the knowledge of Principles, by which they may be reclaim'd, may be said not to have err'd in fundamental saving Faith: For you say, that in the Scripture all fundamental Points are clearly set down.

8. Now give me leave to urge the force of my Text; God buildeth upon a Rock (a full expression of greatest security) not any Church, but that very Church describ'd in my former Section out of the Prophets: And so all that has been said of that Church, must be verified of this; with a reiterated promise, *That the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*; without breach of which Promise this Church could not have err'd so notoriously, as I have shew'd you affirm all Churches visible upon Earth, to have err'd; and particularly the *Roman Church* uses to be styl'd by yours, *Idolatrous, Superstitious, the Seat of Antichrist, the Synagogue of Satan, a Nest of Errors, cover'd with an universal Leprosie, overwhelm'd with more than Cymmerian Darkness, averted by Apostacy from the whole Body of Christ*. This is the

298 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

Character you give of the Roman Church: And then, when we press you with this and other clear Texts; you for your own ends, say, the *Roman Church* err'd not fundamentally; yet your famous French Brother *John Daille*, whose Book of Schism has been now twice or thrice publish'd in *England*, in exprefs terms chargeth the *Roman Church with fundamental Errors overthrowing the Foundations of Christianity*, C. 7. And then in the next Chapter, he begins to shew how our Opinion of Adoring the Eucharist is a fundamental Error; in the proving whereof, he labours even until his nineteenth Chapter, the Title of which, is, *That there be very many other Beliefs in the Church of Rome which overthrow the Foundation of our Faith*. And indeed, he is the true Disciple of *Calvin*, who *Instit.* 4. C. 18. says of us, *They made all the Kings and the People of the Earth drunk, from the first to the last*. Add now to this, that which *Dr. Whitaker Controv.* 4. Q. 5. C. 3. confesseth in these words, *In times past no Religion but the Papistical had place in the Church*. Therefore (say I) if this Papistical Church was such an one as yours describes it; and if there were no other Church but this, the Gates of Hell prevail'd against all Churches upon the Earth. And indeed the very claim which

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 299

which this Church makes to Infallibility, and her conformably pressing all the World to submit to her Definitions, and hold them for Divine Oracles (if they be Errors) *is the very bane of Christendom*, as Dr. Fern calls it, *Sect. 27.* For upon this Principle she may oblige all to hold your Church (which you will say is *Christs* purest Church) not to be any Church at all, but a damnable Congregation of Heretics. How then have not the Gates of Hell prevail'd against her, who teacheth the purest Church to teach most damnable Heresie? And again, if Hell Gates have prevail'd against Her, against what Church did they not, for a thousand years before *Luther*, prevail? So much of this Text.

9. My Eighth Text, to prove the Church to be our Infallible Judge, secur'd by God from leading us into any Error, great or little, is *Matt. 18. 17.* *He that will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Publican or Heathen:* Therefore, meerly for not hearing the Church, a Man, according to the true Judgment of God himself, is to be held (and consequently do's justly deserve to be held) as a Publican or Heathen: But all Men are oblig'd not to do that, by which so heavy a Judgment may deservedly fall upon them: Therefore all Men are oblig'd to hear the Church; the

300 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

the meerly not hearing of her, deserving so heavy a Judgment, even in the sight of God; who saith in the next Verse, That the Churches Judgment (condemning those who refuse to hear her) shall be made good, and approv'd of in Heaven. No Man therefore is secure in Conscience, or innocent in the sight of God, who refuseth to hear, or obey the Church. Hence follows, *First*, That this Church cannot err damnably, for so a Man in Conscience might be bound to follow a damnable Error. *Secondly*, Hence follows, that she cannot err in any small matter belonging to Faith; for all Men being bound to hear her, and follow that which she teaches; and it being impossible any Man should in Conscience be bound to hold the least falsity as an Article of Faith reveal'd by God (for that were to hold God a Revealer or Affirmer of a Lie) it follows, that it is impossible the Church should ever deliver any small Error for an Article of Faith. In hearing and obeying the Church we follow Gods Command: But no kind of Error little or great can be incurred by following Gods Command; therefore in hearing and obeying the Church we can be led into no kind of Error little or great.

10. Now if any one reply, that we are
to

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 301

to hear the Church, so long as she swarveth not from Gods Word. My Answer is, That to swarve from Gods Word is to err: But this Text proves she cannot err; therefore this Text proveth she cannot swarve from Gods Word. And indeed, if she could err, or swarve from *Gods Word*, the meerly not hearing, or not obeying her, could not deserve that a Man should be justly accounted by God as a Publican, or Heathen. See here, N. 19. Others reply, that this Text is to be understood, not of hearing this Church in matters of Faith and Unbelief, but of matters of Trespass between Brother and Brother, which Trespases are also to be told to every particular Church, and to several Prelates; and therefore this place makes nothing for the Authority of the Universal Church. I answer, particular Trespases are to be referr'd to particular Prelates; and that the Church is not to be assembled in a General Council for every private Mans Trespass. Singular private Men are to be condemn'd by their particular Prelates of their particular Churches, proceeding according to the known Decrees and Orders of the Universal Church. If any Man, when they proceed thus, disobey them, he in them disobeys the *Universal Church*; according to whose known Laws, and Decrees,

302 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

crees, these Prelates clearly proceed. And therefore he, meerly for this only Act of Refractory Disobedience to the Church, deserves, by Gods own Judgment, to be accounted as a Publican or Heathen. So we see, that every Man, who disobeyes the particular Judges, judging clearly according to the known Laws of the Commonwealth, disobeyes the Commonwealth. And it is this refractory disobeying, and not hearing the Church, which makes the Crime so enormous: For this teacheth others to do the like; and so all Government falls to confusion, all Order to disorder. Whence you may easily see, that the not obeying and following particular Prelates, in so well ordered a Commonwealth as the Church is, do's commonly come to be the very self same enormous Crime of not hearing the Church. And because all particular Prelates of the Church are suppos'd (if the contrary be not notorious) to do their duty in giving Sentence according to the known Decrees, Orders, and Canons of the Universal Church, those who disobey the Prelates of particular Churches, must (by no less general a manner of speaking) be said to disobey the Universal Church; as those, who disobey the Judge, are said to disobey the Commonwealth. So that at last, this disobedience

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 303

bedience against the Church, is against *Christ* and God himself, according to that which God said to *Samuel*, *Lib. 1. c. 8.* *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me:* And *Christ* to his Disciples, the first Prelates of the Church; *He that despiseth you, despiseth me*, *Luk. 10.* whence you did see *Sect. 8. N. 6.* how *St. Austin* taught us, that if there were a Man appointed by God to be heard by us (and known to be so commission'd) no body would dare to refuse obedience unto him in what he taught; lest so doing, he should be truly judg'd, not so much to have refus'd obedience to this Man, as to have refus'd it to God, who gave Commission to this Man. Just so (as *St. Austin* also discourseth) being it is God who gave this Commission to the Church, obliging all to hear her, with so strict a Command, that the Refusers are to be judg'd, by his express order, as Publicans and Heathens; he who refuseth to submit to this Church, for doing so, is truly judg'd not so much to disobey the Church, as to disobey God who gave the Commission to the Church: See *Sect. 22. N. 5.* And therefore *Christ* commanded the lawful Successors of *Moses* to be obey'd, in what they commanded (to wit, either by public Authority, or by the known Doctrine or Practice formerly order'd by public

304 *The Church is our Infalible Judge.*

public Authority;) altho' these Successors of *Moses* were Men, not wicked in their lives, but also did (on their private Authority) teach Errors, and that publicly; yet never Authoriz'd by any one public definition of the seat of *Moses*. And they were these never-authoriz'd Errors of theirs, which *Christ* call'd *the Leaven of the Pharisees*, bidding his Apostles take heed of it. But now, for as much as concerns the Doctrine, which was authoriz'd by the public definition of that Seat, *Christ* was so far from bidding, even the common People, to take heed of it, that he said publicly, to *the whole promiscuous Multiude, and also to his Disciples; upon the Chair of Moses have sitten the Scribes and Pharisees; all therefore whatsoever they bid you, observe, and do, Matt. 23. v. 1.* Note those most ample words (*All therefore whatsoever.*) O! will you say, what if they bid us do against the Scripture; what must you do? I answer, that just as you must say concerning that Voice, which came from Heaven, Commanding (*Matt. 17.*) to hear our Savior, *Ipsum audite*, was not to be eluded by the Pharisees saying, *Hear him if he teach no falsity*; but was a Declaration from Heaven, that he, who was so universally to be heard, should be secur'd from teaching any falsity:

The Church is our infallible Judge. 305
falsity; see Sect. 22. N. 5. So also these words,
All therefore whatsoever, And these words
of the Text I am now urging, *If any Man*
will not hear the Church, &c. be words con-
taing a Declaration made by our Sa-
viours own Mouth, that the old and new
Church so universally commanded to be
heard, were secur'd from teaching any
falsity. And I shall Answer, before I end
all your chief Objections to the contrary,
Sect. 23.

II. Now as the Synagogues Authority
was to be heard *in all whatsoever they did*
bid in matter of Doctrin, and not only
in Points of Trespasses between Brother,
and Brother; we cannot (without nota-
bly depressing the Authority of *Christ's*
Church, and casting it under the Syna-
gogues) allow to the Synagogue a Power
to be universally heard *in all whatsoever,*
and yet confine the Authority of *Christ's*
Church to those narrow limits of being
heard only in Point of Trespass between
Brother and Brother, whereas the Syna-
gogue is but the Handmaid, the Church
the Sovereign Lady, and *has a better Co-*
venant established upon better promises, Heb.
8. 6. The force then of my Text is this,
If any one will not hear the Church, even in
Trespass between Brother and Brother be-
longing to her Court, *let him be accounted*
as a Publican or Heathen; and much more,
let

306 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

let him be so accounted if he will not hear the Church in such Trespaffes which one Brother commits against all his Brothers, and against his Dearest Mother the Church; this being incomparably a crime more hainous, and more particularly belonging to the Court of the Church, over which crime if God had not given her Power, he had not given her sufficient Power for her own Preservation, as every Commonwealth has, and of necessity must have, especially so ample a Commonwealth, as was intended to be dilated over the whole face of the Earth, and to be established in a vast extent for ever. Wherefore as our Adversaries use to say, that every Kingdom or Commonwealth must needs have Power to make Laws and Statutes, of sufficient efficacy to keep off all Foreign Jurisdiction, by which it may be ruined, because as *Suarez* saith (lib. 3. de Primat. Pont. G. 1. N. 4.) *human Nature cannot be destitute of necessary remedies to its own preservation*; so we say God having Erected a Kingdom to stand for ever, as *Daniel* called his Church (of which I spoke the last Sect. N. 9.) he cannot but be supposed to have given this his Kingdom, or Church that Ecclesiastical Power which was requisite to preserve it from all secular insurrections, against the Ecclesiastical

The Church is our infallible Judge. 307

or Spiritual Power thereof; or else it might easily be quitted and cast off by them all. This Kingdom then, being to Reign in the middle of all Nations, he gave it a Spiritual Jurisdiction over all Nations, in so much as he said to his Church, *The Nation and Kingdom which will not serve thee, shall perish; of which I spoke more the last Sect. N. 8.* Whosoever than broacheth any Heresie, as a Poisoned Cup prepared to the ruin, not of one Brothers Body, but of as many Brothers Souls as he can any way intice to drink thereof: If he still persists in this malicious Practice, and so, to the notorious Trespassing of all his Brethren, and Dearest Mother, continues committing this Soul-murthering Crime of Heresie (a Crime the most destructive of the Common good that can be thought of) he is questionless to be proceeded against by the Church, to which if he submit not, he, most deservedly, in the highest degree, is to be counted a Publican or Heathen. And Note, that all Heretics are not only guilty of this Soul-murthering Crime of Heresie, but by standing out against the Prelates of the Church, in the maintaining of their Heresie, they fall into Schism; which Crime of its own Nature (as *St. Thomas* affirms) is the most hainous Trespass against our Brothers,
and

308 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

and against the most solemn Band of fraternal Charity, that can be committed. If therefore Trespasses against our Brethren belong to the Court of the Church, and she is here by God made the Judge thereof, with that high Prerogative of having her Sentence ratified in Heaven, then doubtless those whom she Condemns are Condemn'd persons, both in the sight of God and Men. She therefore, under so great a penalty, being to be heard, is secur'd from all kind of Error in her Sentence, or Decree. And as the broaching of Heresie, and the standing out in defence of it by Schism, is incomparably more destructive to our Brethren, and offensive to our Mother the Church, when this is done by a great Multitude, or a whole Nation; so in this Case, the Crime more neerly concerns the Court of the Church, and she is impowered to pass Sentence against it; which being no less, but rather more just, than in the former Case, will no less, but rather more assuredly, be ratified in Heaven. I Note this for Dr. *Fern's* sake, who, under pretence of Reformation, licenseth a whole Nation to stand out against all other Churches, *Sect. 4.*

12. Here fitly comes in the discussing of that (which some inconsiderately use, to elude the force of this Text,) that this Sentence:

The Church is our infallible Judge. 309

Sentence of the Church consists only in an exterior Excommunication, in which she may Err, and the Party (erroneously Excommunicated) may be a just Man in the sight of God. I Answer, If we deceive not our selves by putting a Case different from that which concerns the true understanding of this Text, the matter will soon be cleared. This Text speaks of one who will not hear, nor submit to the Church, after she has given Sentence against him: Give me a Man, who, in this Case, do's not submit to the Church, and this very not submission of his, cannot but be that very crime, for which *Christ* himself holds him accountable as a Publican or Heathen, and affirms that this Sentence shall be ratified in Heaven; wherefore it is impossible this Censure should be unjust, if he be truly guilty of not hearing the Church. It is true, that by false information, or some such way, a Man may be judged to be guilty of not hearing the Church, when really in the sight of God he is not guilty; and so there may sometimes be an Error in the mistake of the Fact; and thus *Clave errante*, by an Error only in matter of Fact (in which the Church is not infallible,) the Sentence will not be ratified in Heaven. But this is nothing to the purpose of our Adversaries, who

310 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

who would have a Man be innocent in the sight of God, who professes in many particulars not to conform to what the Sentence of the Church commands all to conform; For Example, to adore the Sacred Eucharist, &c. Every Man who professes this, professes not to hear the Sentence of the Church, which is still by severe Censures pressing it upon him. Wherefore in pronouncing Sentence here (where the fact of not hearing the Church is maintain'd as good and laudable,) there can be no Error in the Fact; for they confess and profess that here they neither do, nor will hear the Church, against which they (with Dr. Fern, Sect. 10.) say, they have *Evidence of Scripture, demonstration of Reason, and a conformable consent of Primitive times, the pure Ages of the Church.* Wherefore when the Church pronounceth these Persons, so notoriously refractory, to be accounted as Publicans, or Heathens, her Sentence shall be ratified in Heaven, and either Scripture must be false, or those Men guilty.

13. That all may clearly see what an empty boast this is, which Dr. Fern, and others make of their having *evidence of Scripture against what our Church teacheth*; I challenge him, or any other, to shew, if he can, by Scripture only (for that you all make your Judge) that the Texts
which

The Church is our infallible Judge. 311

which here I alledge for the Church her being our infallible Judge, cannot be interpreted truly, as our Church says they are to be interpreted. For to shew this, it is not enough for you to devise some different Interpretation, in which it is possible for these Texts to be taken: For it is no proof to say, *This may be the true Interpretation, therefore it is so: Or, it seems probably to be so, therefore evidently this, and no other but this Interpretation is true:* But you must, (and that by evidence of Scripture only) shew that these Texts cannot be truly interpreted, as our Church interprets them; and you must prove by Scripture only, that the Tradition, by which she has received these Interpretations, is not a true Tradition descended from the Apostles. For if it be a true Tradition (the contrary to which can never be evidently demonstrated out of Scripture alone) she is grounded as well as those who received their Doctrin from Scripture only. For the Tongues of the Apostles were as infallible as their Pens; and what they said, and caused to be reduced to practice all the World over, is far less subject, to be either counterfeited, or mistaken, than their writings. You also will never Answer what I said, that these Texts, which now I am bringing for this Point, be as clear evidences

312 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

evidences out of Scripture for the Churches being our infallible Judge, as those other Texts brought by you, and examin'd here by me, *Sect. 10.* be clear evidences to demonstrate that Scripture only is to be our Judge; which Point, if you cannot make more evident out of Scripture than I make this Point, it is manifest, that you stand out against all the Prelates of all the Churches under which you lived before your division, without convincing them by evidence of Scripture that you might and ought refuse submission to them. The Church then being in possession of her Authority over you, and not manifestly convinced by you with any evidence of Scripture (of the Evidence of which there is far more reason she should be Judge, than you) you, for not hearing her, are by her just Sentence denounced to be held as Publicans or Heathens, and this Sentence is ratified in Heaven.

14. *My Ninth* Text, to prove the Church Infallible in her Definitions and Judgments, is out of St. Paul *1 Tim. 3.* calling her *The Church of the living God, the Pillar and ground of the Truth.* May not all securely rely in their Faith upon the very Pillar of Truth? May they not, most groundedly, ground their Faith upon the very ground of Truth it self? what do

we

The Church is our infallible Judge. 313

we say more? Now I pray, what possibility can there be for you to shew by evident Scripture, that this Text is not capable of this interpretation, which our Church gives unto it? In place of shewing this (which only makes to the purpose;) you go about to shew that Text *may have* other interpretations, therefore (you infer) this is not the true one, which is a pitiful Argument. For what Text was ever cited by St. *Paul*, or other Apostles, which might not have had some other interpretation put upon it? Thus in place of bringing evident Scripture against us, you still bring your own interpretations of it, as if Scripture (fallibly interpreted by you) were to be our Judge. What Text have you for that? If you say, Scripture interpreted truly, must be our Judge; but you do interpret it truly; therefore Scripture, as you interpret it, must be our Judge; What Heretic will not say thus much for his Damnable interpretations? Tell me then, what interpretation can be demonstrated to be the only true one, which is different from our interpretation, which saith thus: The Church being the Pillar it self of Truth, we may, without fear of ever Erring, rely upon her? She being the very ground of Truth it self; we are securely grounded, as long as we are grounded on

314 *The Church is our Infalible Judge.*

her Authority. What have you in Scripture only, to prove this interpretation to be manifestly false, as you must prove it against so public Authority? what (I say) have you out of Scripture only, to demonstrate this? Nothing. But in place of bringing us evidence of Scripture, so vainly boasted of, you bring us for your best Answer, an interpretation of your own, which you say must be true, because perhaps it may be true; As if I should sufficiently prove that *A. B.* must be a Thief, because perhaps he may be so. To Answer in the like form, I may as well say, this interpretation of yours must be false; because perhaps it may be false. But let us hear what your best interpretation is. You commonly say, there is a double Pillar, and a double Ground: One Pillar, or Ground which is principal, and that is the Scripture; an other Pillar or Ground subordinate to the former, and that is the Church. But this double dealing in distinguishing, helps you not. The Church must still be a true Pillar and a true Ground of the Truth. *The People believed God and Moses*, saith the Scripture, *Ex. 14. v. 31.* *Moses* was infinitely under God, and subordinate to him, as the Church is under Scripture and subordinate to it; and yet this did not hinder but that all the People did most truly believe

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 315

believe *Moses*, and ground their Faith on what he said; because they knew he had received what he taught, from God. So all the subordination the Church has to Scripture, do's not hinder, but that we may truly rely in our Belief upon the Church as the People relied upon *Moses*, because we also know that what the Church teacheth, she has received from God by *Christ*, and his Apostles. Again, the Tradition or Doctrin of our Church is as secure, as the Tradition or Doctrin of the Church in the Law of Nature was for all those two thousand years which were before all Scripture; but then men might (and all did) securely rely on that Church as the Pillar and Ground of Truth, on which all their Faith relied: *Ergo* they may now thus rely on *Christ's* Church. Again, what clear Text have you to prove, that *Christ's* Church is less secur'd from falsity, than that Church? Had not this Ground been sure enough (as it had not if that Church had been fallible) the Faith of all the World, could not have been grounded sufficiently upon it: And that which is most to our purpose, at that very time in which St. *Paul* did call the Church the Pillar and Ground of the Truth; he did call her so before the Canon of the Scripture was finished, before which time, you your selves confess the Church

316 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

might be, and was securely relyed upon, in all points of Faith; and no one Christian can, by any Text, be proved to have then understood *St. Paul* to speak these words of the Church, as of a Pillar and Ground of Truth subordinate to the Canon of Scripture when it should be finished. How then comes this now to be the only true Sense of Scripture? What Text have you to prove (and that demonstratively) that the Church of *Christ*, which, before any word of the new Testament was written, was the Pillar and Ground of Truth, and that so universally, that she was secur'd from proposing any Error to be believed, were it great or little; but yet she, immediately upon the writing of the Scripture (confirming this title unto her) became less universally a Pillar and Ground of Truth, and more subject to Error than before? You, who will have nothing of moment held without clear Scripture, shew but one single clear Text of Scripture for this. More again of this *Sect.* 16. in the beginning *N.* 1, 2, 3.

15. Another shift to elude the force of my Text, is, to say, that by these words *St. Paul* intended only to set forth the office of the Church, and not her Authority. For Gods sake mark how you handle Scripture against us. You say you will
bring

The Church is our infallible Judge. 317

bring evident demonstration of Scripture, and now you bring your meer conjectures of St. Pauls inward and secret intention, known to God only. Let me then ask you, What Text tells you clearly that St. Paul had only an intention to set forth the Churches Office, and not her Authority? Whereas, in fewer words, I think it scarce possible more fully, and more emphatically, to set forth her infallible Authority, than by terming her *the Pillar and ground of Truth*; which words strike so strong upon our Understandings, even at the first hearing of them, that the first consequence we can make from hence is; *therefore upon this Pillar of Truth we may securely rely in our belief of Truth*; *Therefore upon this ground of truth we may safely ground our Belief*. Concerning the Office of this Church no man thinks, until he be put in mind, or hath turned a while his Understanding to the search of several interpretations. St. Paul then using words as sufficient to declare the infallible Authority of the Church, as Men in ordinary speech use to do, yea, using a most expressive Metaphor, which comes fully home to this intent, what do you but tell us your bare conjectures (and those most weakly grounded) when you tell us, you know his intention was not to declare the Authority of the Church. Some prove

318 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

prove this weak conjecture by another weaker: for they say, to what purpose was it for *St. Paul* instructing *Timothy*, how to behave himself in the Church of God, to set forth unto him her infallible Authority? I Answer, that it was not only much to the purpose to instruct all posterity in one of the most necessary Points, but also it was most pertinent to that particular end of moving *Timothy* to behave himself irreprehensibly in the Church, because she was constituted the Public Oracle for all the World, that all in all Ages might come to her for secure direction in their Faith, and for assured decision of all their controversies (she being a Pillar and Ground of Truth) *St. Paul* thought fit to admonish *Timothy*, and all other Prelates in his person, so to behave themselves, as not, by their misdemeanour, to make men think it improbable that God should give a perpetual infallible assistance to such a Church, whose prime and first Governors (who should be the Patern of the rest) lived scandalously or less Godly. How much do, (not your multitude only) but even your greatest Doctors, think themselves to say against the Church of *Rome*, claiming this Infallibility (yet improbably say you;) because her Prelates have been avaritious, cruel, lascivious, or
other-

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 319

otherwise scandalous? This indeed is a pitiful Argument, for so it should be prov'd improbable that God assisted infallibly wicked Men to write (without the least Error) some parts of the Holy Scripture. And yet we know *David* was both an Adulterer and Murderer; *Solomon* was an Idolater, who went after *Astoroth the Goddess of the Sidonians*; and after *Michom the abomination of the Amornites*, 1 Kings 11. v. 5. 7. Of diverse Books we know not the Authors, and so we cannot tell whether they were good or bad. Yet as pitiful an Argument as this is, we know it troubles weak Souls; and therefore you use it against us. Wherefore, to take away all scandal from these little ones, it was very convenient that Bishops, especially those who first held that place in the Church (as *Timothy* did) should be blameless, continent, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, &c. For such good Precepts as these were here given by *St. Paul*, as much making to his purpose; to maintain the credit of such a Church as might seem to all, fit to be that which indeed was constituted by the Public Oracle of the World, the Pillar and Ground of Truth.

16. My Tenth Text is out of the last words of *St. Matthew*, Go you therefore, and teach all Nations, Baptising them, &c.

320 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

and loe I am with you always, even to the end of the World. The Apostles, in their own Persons, were not to be here Teaching and Baptising until the end of the World: Therefore, not only according to St. *Austin* and St. *Hierom* upon this place, but also according to manifest reason, these words were spoken as a promise both to them and to their Successors for ever, by whom they were for ever to be Teaching all Nations, and Baptising; and consequently, this Promise was made to the Assembly of Teachers, Doctors, and Bishops of that visible Church, in which they were visibly to perform all that belong'd to the instruction of all Nations unto the Worlds end. That Church which had no such visible Being in all Ages, hath no share in this Promise; for who is not the party to which the Promise is made, ha's no part in the Promise. You then, having no share in it, enviously labor to lessen it, by saying, That it is not to be understood that there should be equality of assistance in all Ages, securing the Church at all times, from all Error in every Age, as she was secur'd in the First Age, when she was govern'd by the Apostles: And after they had written the Scriptures, there was no further need of any other infallible Rule; a lesser assistance therefore

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 321

fore might serve after Ages. I answer, that this is only to tell me what you think might be said: But where is your *Evidence of Scripture*, to demonstrate, that the Assistance God promised was indeed extended to Infallibility in the first Age; but was not so in any other Age? I ask for Infallible Texts, and not for Fallible Reasons: Tho' I must tell you, that according to Reason, after the first Age (when the Church was now grown from a Grain of Mustard-seed to be a vast Tree, extending her Branches from Sea to Sea, and still growing to a greater extent) in process of following Ages, there must needs, in so huge a compass of the World, imbracing Men of different Understandings, Dictamens, Principles, Educations, Instructions, Humors, and Wills; there must (I say) needs happen in the progress of many Ages (still remov'd further, and further from *Christ's* time, and the days of the Apostles) a world of Doubts, Debates and Controversies, some affirming such and such Books to belong to the true Canon of Scripture; others rejecting them as *Apocrypha*. Some affirming such and such Copies to be the only true uncorrupted Copies of those Books; others affirming those to be corrupted, and others different from them to

322 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

be the only true ones. And again, after they had agreed upon the true Books, and the true Copies (tho' perhaps they might in that agree in a fundamental Error) yet they would be sure mainly to disagree about the true Sense of those Copies. Why then might not *Christ*, to secure his Church from erring in so important Controversies (undecidable by Scripture,) promise also an assistance extended to Infallibility in latter Ages, as well as in the first Age? For Infallibility was given to the Apostles, not for their own sakes, but for the good of those whom they were to teach, and to secure them from Error. Now the Christian People of after Ages were incomparably more in number, and their very number made them incomparably more subject (in process of many Ages still remoter from *Christ*) to be led into inextricable Errors; wherefore surely they did exceedingly need this Infallible Assistance, given, as I said, for the Peoples sake. Those who had been instructed by the Apostles, before Scripture was written, converted and instructed thousands, who never had heard any Apostle preach: All these believ'd upon the Authority of the then present Church, and their Faith was Infallible; therefore that Church, which was then before

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 323

fore Scripture, had an Infallible Assistance to secure her from proposing any Error. What Scripture tells you she lost this Assistance when Scripture was written? And that Men could not rely upon her Authority, when now, besides the help of Tradition, she had also the help of Scripture to rule her self by? See this more fully, S. 16. N. 2. You say, this Infallible Assistance was less necessary for her after she had receiv'd the Scripture. I might say, it was more necessary; because in process of time Heretics would arise, who would affirm the Scriptures to have been purposely written to be our sole and only Rule of Faith; and this they would say of Scripture as Interpreted by them, and not as Interpreted by any Infallible, Visible Interpreter. This Heresie, into which all Heretics have ever fallen, makes the necessity of an Infallible Assistance greater after the writing of Scripture, than it was before. Again, what Scripture tells you that God is so sparing in his providing means for the direction of his Church, that, giving them Scripture, he will subtract his assistance formerly extended to Infallibility, and not leave them, with their Bibles in their Hands, to go which way every one in his private Judgment shall think fittest, without the former

324 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

former direction of a Public, Visible, and Infallible Guide? Had we not better have kept such a Guide still? Dr. Fern could not but acknowledge, *That such a Visible, Infallible Judge, or Umpire of all Christendom, would (if to be had) be a ready means to compose all differences, and restore truth and Peace, S. 27.* The Church was this Infallible, Visible Judge before Scripture was written; and it is also confess'd, that such a Judge would now, after we have the Scripture, be an exceeding benefit; Why then do you say, God took away this inestimable gift from his Church with one hand, when he gave the Scripture with the other; there not being the least Text in Scripture for so important an assertion? I think any one would hold it most rash to say, that St. *John the Evangelist*, after he had writ the last words of the whole Canon or Scripture, presently lost his Infallibility in Teaching, Instructing, Guiding, Interpreting, &c. Why then should the whole Church of *Christ* lose that Infallibility which confess'dly she had before the Canon was quite finish'd? Again, you cannot say the Scripture was superfluously written, tho' the Church, before the writing thereof, was an Infallible Guide: How then can you say the Infallible Guidance of the Church is superfluous, after the writing
of

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 325

of the Scripture; especially, being such an Infallible Guidance is even now confess'd to be so ready a means to end all Controversies; which among those who admit no such Guides, are endless? See also my next *Sett.* N. 1, 2, 3. *Christ* therefore, not only in the first Age, but even to the consummation of the World, is with his Church; but he is not with those who introduce, and father upon him, as the first Revealer thereof, many gross and intolerable Errors and Superstitions, as you call those which you found in all Churches upon the Face of the Earth, this last thousand years: Therefore these last thousand years he was not with his Church, or else her Errors were not such as needed so sad a Reformation as yours was, to the disturbance of all Christendom. If her Errors were tolerable, they should (to avoid so great mischiefs) have been tolerated; if they were intolerable, how was *Christ* with her? Or what other Church can you name, whose Errors were not as intolerable? Now that all may clearly see, that this Promise of *Christ* assur'd the Church of an Assistance extended to an Infallible Security from all Error fundamental, or not fundamental; This will appear by that farther, and fuller explication made of this Promise in
St. John,

326 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

St. John, who writ on purpose to explicate more fully some Points, less fully set down by the former Evangelists.

17. *My Eleventh Text* is out of St. John, where C. 14. v. 15. our Savior saith, *I will pray the Father and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth whom the World cannot receive. And v. 27. The Comforter which is the Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in my Name, he shall teach you all things, and suggest unto you all things whatsoever I shall say unto you (fundamental or not fundamental.) And C. 16. v. 12. I have yet many things to say unto you (the fundamentals be not many things, as you all confess;) Howbeit, when the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth, not only fundamental, but also not fundamental, which belong to those many things which I (who have told you things fundamental) have not yet told you. In these things this Spirit will guide you into all Truth. But all Truth excludes all Errors, not only in fundamental, but also in not-fundamental Points. You know not which Points be fundamental, which not; which destructive of Salvation, which not; which curable, which incurable: Yet fear not; believe the Church in teaching these, or any other Points; for she, guided by this Spirit of Truth,*
will

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 327

will guide you into all Truth. But you will say, How long shall her chief Pastors have this great priviledge? *For ever*, saith the first part of my Text; by which words it is made evident that the promise was made, not only to them for themselves (they not being to live *for ever* teaching us these Truths;) but also for their Successors in the prime Government of the Church, who were to guide the People into all Truth *for ever*; as I shall presently shew farther out of St. Paul. I argue hence (just as I did before;) This assistance which was promis'd *for ever*, was *ever*, and in all ages, perform'd; therefore in those Ten Ages (which made the Thousand years before your Reformation) this promise was performed; Therefore what all the prime Prelates of the Church did teach all that while for Truth, was not erroneous, or superstitious: But in all these Ages they all confessedly did teach for Truth those very Points, which you hold to be our grossest Errors; Therefore these be not Errors, but Truth. Here you see again clearly, why this great promise cannot belong to your Prelates or other Governors of your Church, as it is different from ours. *First*, because you had no visible Governors at all of your Church as distinct from ours. For Governors must needs be visibly chosen, have visible subjects,

328 *The Church is our Infallible Judge:*
jects, send forth visible Decrees, &c. Name
such Governors as these different from
ours, if you can. You can name none but
ours. With ours then only *the Holy Ghost*
abided all these Ages, *guiding them into all*
Truth. Whence *Secondly* it follows, that he
cannot now be guiding your Governors
into all Truth, they being manifestly
guided into Opinions directly opposite to
those Doctrins which were, all these last
Thousand years, taught by all those
who were Governors of the Church. If
you could shew Governors of Churches in
all these last Ten Ages still teaching those
Points in which you differ from us, with-
out teaching other notorious Errors,
then indeed you might have some colour
to plead, that this Spirit of Truth might
as truly have been said promised to the
Governors of your Church, as to those
of ours: But this promise, not being per-
form'd to them (there being no such per-
sons to be found in those Ages) was not
doubtless promised to them, otherwise
Christ's promise had not been perform'd.

18. *My Twelfth and last Text*, shewing
clearly that this promis'd assistance was
extended to Infallibility, is *Ephes. 4.*
Whence appears, that the end and in-
tention of *Christ* in giving the chief Go-
vernors of that Church (which was to
be visible in all Ages) was such an end,
and

The Church is our infallible Judge. 329

and such an intention, as could not be compassed by giving us such chief Governors, Guides and Instructors in Belief, as were meerly fallible, and who might lead us into circumvention of Error, even then, when they were legally assembled together to deliver the Truth, from their highest Tribunal, in a general Council. For had all these our chief Governors, even then, been liable to broach gross Errors, vented for Divine Verities (and pressed upon all to be admitted as such) how had *Christ* obtained that end for which he gave us these our prime Governors, Guides and Instructors? For he gave some Apostles (succeeding always in full Apostolical Authority, as we see in *St. Peters* Successors:) some Prophets (those saith *St. Thom. Rom. 12. v. 6.* are called Prophets in the New Testament who expound the Prophetical sayings with that Spirit with which the Scripture was written;) and some Evangelists (that is, Preachers of the Gospel. So *Philip* is called an Evangelist, *Act. 21. v. 8.* So *St. Paul* bad *Timothy* do the work of an Evangelist, *Tim. 4. v. 5.*) some Pastors and Teachers, whose Offices are more known. But to what end did he give all these? It follows, *For the perfecting the Saints.* How pitifully should they be perfected

330 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

perfected by obtruders of gross intolerable Errors for Divine Verities? *For the work of the Ministry*; how pitifully also had such Men perform'd this work? *For the edifying of the Body of Christ*; such Broachers of Errors had been fitter to work her destruction. How long did God intend to give all these sorts of persons, of which some were to be endued with the plenitude of Apostolical Authority, and consequently with an Infallible Authority: How long, I say, did God give such to his Church? *Till we all come into the Unity of the Faith*; which will not be until the last days of all: Wherefore, until the end of the World, the World shall be provided. But are we, by being thus provided, sufficiently secur'd from all Error? The next Verse will tell you, that this was Gods chief intent, *That we henceforth be no more Children to be tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine, by the subtlety of Men and cunning craftiness, whereof they lie in wait to deceive.* Gods end then was so to provide us of a means, by which we might be so secur'd in our Belief, that no Mans Craft or Cunning might be able to toss us too and fro; as we see now all they are, who hold themselves able to bring evidence of Scripture, against all those who for the last ten Ages have been Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 331
itors and Teachers in *Christs* Visible
Church.

19. To elude some of my Texts, our
Adversaries use to say, We must indeed
hear the Church, as long as she teacheth
what is conformable to Scripture; and so
long the Gates of Hell shall not prevail
against her; so long, and no longer, she
is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, and
God is with her, &c. I answer, *First*,
That in consequence to this the Father
of Lies himself may be believ'd so long
as he teacheth conformably to Scripture.
Secondly, Who sees not how ridiculous it
is to say, *We shall hear the truth from the
Church, as long as she do's not teach against
the Truth.* Is this to be the Pillar of
Truth? A Straw is a Pillar as long as it
bendeth not, and Quicksand is sure
Ground until it yields. Blasphemous is
the sense which makes *Christ* speak non-
sense. As all by a voice from Heaven
were bid to hear *Christ*, so all are bidden
by *Christ* to hear his Church: Her Go-
vernors therefore shall never come by
unanimous consent to propose Lies for
Articles of Faith. For if all should teach
a Lie (as every Error against Scripture is
a Lie) with whom is that Promise made
good, That *the Spirit of Truth should guide
them into all Truth*? If we may be misled
by all those Guides which God gave his
Church,

332 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

Church, to the end *that we hence forth be no more Children toſſ'd to and fro, and carried about, &c.* how ſhort did God fall of his intent in falling upon ſuch Guides, as being liable ſo to ſwarve from the Scripture, muſt needs leave us, yea, make us *toſſed to and fro*. Read but over the Texts I cited laſt Section out of the Old Teſtament, and you ſhall ſee how flatly this Interpretation oppoſeth Gods Word, *which ſhall never depart from the Churches Mouth, nor her Seed, nor the Seed of her Seed, &c.* See alſo my Answer above, N. 10. *Thirdly*, Thus you will leave no Text to prove ſhe hall never err in fundamentals, for you will ſtill be answer'd; that ſo long as in them ſhe teacheth conformably to Scripture, ſhe ſhall not err in them; but if once in them ſhe teacheth not conformably to Scripture, ſhe ſhall err even in them; and ſo *Chriſt* ſhall have no Church.

20. Having now ended the compleat Dozen of Texts brought partly out of the old Scriptures, manifeſtly promiſing Infallibility to *Chriſts* Church; partly out of the New, manifeſtly conſerring the ſame: I cannot but deſire all thoſe who read thoſe lines out of a deſire of finding the Truth, that they would ſtay here a while, and examin carefully whether theſe Texts be not clearer, and
come

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 333

come not far more home, than those Texts which were the best Dr. Fern brought to prove, *that Scripture by it self is so our Infallible Judge?* See those Texts examin'd, *Seet. 10.* See also if you have any thing near so good grounds out of Scripture for any one of those twenty four Points which I have shew'd to be necessary to Salvation, and for which consequently you say you have clear Scripture. Confer these with the best you have for the keeping the *Sunday*, for Baptizing Infants, &c. which I have here examin'd; and ask your own Conscience, whether you can be able to give your own Judge a reason why you did not hear his Voice, speaking far more home in these Texts, than he did in those? *Lastly*, I again call upon our Adversaries, to shew *by evidence of Scripture*, if they can, that these twelve Texts here cited by me, are not capable of that Interpretation which we, conformably to our Churches Doctrin, have given them? But still we note that they fall short of doing this, so long as they only shew, that it is possible to invent some different Interpretation of these Texts, from that which we have given them; for so even the Texts which the Apostles have Interpreted out of the Old Scripture, may be shew'd to have been capable

334 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

pable of other Interpretations, tho' the Interpretations they gave them were very true: You must then shew, and that by *evident demonstration*, that the Interpretation which our Church gives them, is not true; or else vain is your boast, that you hear not our Church, because *you have evident demonstration of Scripture against her*; for no less can suffice against so public Authority, even according to your own Principles.

Sect. 16.

The same is prov'd by several Reasons.

1. **T**HE First Reason, why the Church must needs be furnish'd with some Infallible Means besides the use of Scripture, (which use is not Infallible tho' the Scriptures be Infallible) is taken out of that which I touch'd upon (Sect. 10. N. 13.) to wit, that there is no Reason, nor any one single Text, teaching that the Church in the Law of Nature, should be said to be priviledg'd with Infallibility, above the Church of *Christ* in the Law of Grace: But the Church in the Law of Nature, which lasted for two thousand years (until the first writing of Scripture by *Moses*) was all that while Infallible in proposing true Traditions,

Traditions; and not so much as liable to propose false ones. This I prove, because all the Faith which the true believing People had in those two thousand years was Infallible, tho' it relied only on the proposal of the Church; proposing such or such a Point as receiv'd from God revealing to *Adam* or some other Patriarch those Verities; for Example, That they were to observe the Sabbath, *Gen. 2.* The distinction between clean and unclean Beasts and Meats, *Gen. 7. and Gen. 9. v. 3.* That the Soul is immortal; That the Rewards and Punishments of the next life lasted for ever; That they were, by the fall of *Adam*, conceiv'd in Original Sin; That such and such remedies were to be us'd to free themselves and their Children from it; what Repentance they were to use; how fast they were to stand to their Traditions; how they were to account it a most damnable Sin to forsake them, &c. This was the Faith of all true Believers in the World, which for two thousand years had no other ground than the Revelation of God, as propos'd by the Tradition of the Church present to all Believers in every Age, in which these Believers liv'd. And tho' their Tradition was inferior to ours, as I shew'd in the place now cited, yet the Church then, in every Age, was
infallible

336 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

infallible in propounding that which they had once received by Revelation: And the believers of each Age resting upon the infallible Authority which their present Church had in propounding those Divine Verities, *had the same Spirit of Faith*, as St. Paul saith, 2 Cor. 4. The misbelievers then had the same Spirit also which they have now in opposing the Churches Tradition. This Spirit, before the Flood, was in *Cain*, who, as *Thargum Hierosolymitanum* saith, *protested to Abel that there was no Justice, nor Judge, nor other World than this, nor no reward for Vertue, nor punishment for Sins*: And perhaps he used the Argument which Dr. Fern and many now use, that his part was Negative, *Abels* Affirmative, and so *Abel* was bound to prove what he held; which because he could do only by Tradition, *Cain* (having the true misbelievers Spirit) scoffed at all Tradition: His Heresie made the World so corrupt, that few just Men were left at the Flood of *Noah*, altho' this Heresie was strangely opposed by *Enoch*, above Four hundred years before the Flood, whence St. Jude (v. 11.) having said, *Woe be to them for they have gone in the way of Cain*, adds (v. 14.) *And Enoch also the Seventh from Adam prophesied of these, saying, behold our Lord comes in his Holy Thousands to do Judgment*

The Church is our infallible Judge. 337

Judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly amongst them of their ungodly deeds. After Noab's Flood, these deniers of Gods Judgment being extinguish'd; Nimrod was the second Arch-heretic, as *Josephus* witnesseth, *l. 1. Antiq. C. 4.* for he taught, *That Men were not beholding to God, but to themselves for Temporal Prosperity;* and thus Heresies, by contempt of Tradition, again multiply'd: Yet still God had a visible Church holding fast the above nam'd Traditions receiv'd from *Adam*, as the keeping of the Sabbath, &c. And some five hundred years before God gave the first Scripture to the Children of *Israel* only; he did separate *Abraham* from all other Nations, giving afterwards unto him and his the Precept of Circumcision (*Gen. 17.*) which Precept (tho' no Scripture could be then shew'd) was, for above four hundred years, observ'd by his Posterity as a necessary Precept. Upon Tradition also they believ'd the Covenant God made to *Abraham* of making him the Father of many Nations; and that the Messias should be born of his Seed. Then after *Moses's* days Scripture was written, but given only to the Children of *Israel*: No other Nation being bound to submit to this Law. All other Nations, as they had then several true Believers among them, when *Abraham*

Q

was

338 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

was separated from them, so there is not the least mention of their total decay in belief after that Separation; all they then still Believ'd what they had believ'd before, upon the same ground as they did before, neither were the Scriptures promulg'd among them. And thus true Faith might be preserv'd among many who never heard of Scripture until *Christs* time; that is, for another two thousand years, and more. Just so true Faith, even after *Christs* time, was preserv'd among many without any Scripture; as I shall by and by shew. But to go on, We read that *Job* and his Friends (when or wheresoever they liv'd) liv'd not among the progeny of *Abraham*; and yet *Job* was most eminent in Vertue and true Faith, and his Friends (and probably many of his and their Neighbors) believ'd in one God, held the Resurrection of the Flesh, and that God should judge all according to their works, and divers other Points, relying still only upon Tradition. Why should the Tradition of *Christs* Church be more fallible than theirs was? As I argued, *Sect.* 13. See that place, and also what I said, *Sect.* 10. N. 13. and you will see that there is far greater Reason why our Tradition should be credited more than theirs. Is not *Christs* Church nobler
than

The Church is our infallible Judge. 339

than theirs? Did God give them any means fitter to secure their Traditions from being falsified, than he gave his Church: Could Tradition be an infallible Ground for above 4000 years before *Christ*, and can it not have been so ever since *Christ* for 1686 years? Add also to this, that the Children of *Israel*, tho' they had the Scriptures, yet they had not all necessary Points written in their Scripture, but did rely wholly upon the Tradition of their Church for the truth of them, as I shew'd, *Sect.* 10. *N.* 7.

2. My Second Reason, to prove the Church is provided of some infallible means for the secure direction of her Children, is, that not only from the beginning of the World to *Christ's* preaching his new Gospel, the infallible Faith of several true Believers had no other Ground but the Infallibility of their respectively present Church, in proposing the Traditions she had receiv'd; but also the first true Believers in *Christ* rely'd in their Faith upon the Infallibility of *Christ's* Church, not having any other infallible Ground but her Authority, affirming that she, by Tradition, had receiv'd such and such Points taught her by *Christ*, or his Apostles. See what I said in my last *Sect.* *N.* 16. This manner of believing, even our own Protestant Adversaries confess

340 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

to have been infallible, until the whole Canon of the Scripture was written, and divulg'd, which was some seventy or eighty years after *Christs* Passion. Now how this manner of security relying upon the Church, which, from the beginning of the World unto the finishing of the last Book of Scripture and publishing of the same, had been the common practice of true Believers, did presently turn to be Popish, and unlawful, I cannot conceive: But I am sure all our Adversaries stoutly affirm that it is so; and here their part is affirmative, and affirmative of the unlawfulness of that which from the beginning of the World was ever lawful unto that day. Wherefore to plead against so long a Prescription (that the World was not capable of a longer) for introducing a new Obligation of not believing upon a Ground which had been, for above four thousand years, able to bear all the Faith of the World, *evidence of Scripture* ought to be brought: What then more reasonable than to ask of them to cite at least one single clear Text, commanding all the Believers of *Christs* Church to give over relying upon her Authority, as now never to be any more infallible after the finishing and publishing of the last Book of Scripture? Our Adversaries cannot bring any such Text affirming

The Church is our infallible Judge. 341

affirming this clearly, without we will be pleas'd to take their fallible and ungrounded Interpretations to be a ground sure enough to make the Texts reach home to the proof of what we demand; which cannot be allow'd by us; because, by their own confession, their Interpretation is fallible: And we must have an infallible ground to overthrow an infallible Authority, standing sure even from the beginning of the World. Call then, and call again and again, for this Text, and be sure to allow no Interpretation to help the Text to reach home, but such as can, by clear Scripture, be shew'd to convince that the Text tells you evidently, that after the finishing and publishing of the last Book of Scripture, no body was ever to rely upon the Church's Authority, now grown fallible, tho' ever before infallible. Do but stand close to this, and their vain boast of demonstrating this by Scripture, will fall down dead before thy Feet to be tramp'd upon by thee. Yea; not to condemn their own Brethren the *Lutherans* (who deny the *Apocalyps* or *Revelations* to be Scripture) they will tell thee, that for diverse Ages this Book was not known to be certain Scripture, and yet perhaps this was the very last Book of Scripture, until the publishing of which the Infallibility of the Church was to

342 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

last. If this be so, then you must allow it probable that the Infallibility of the Church lasteth until this very day, for any certainty we have of the contrary: For your *Lutheran* Brethren will say, that Book of the *Apocalyps* was never as yet sufficiently publish'd to the Church to be Scripture; for if it were so, they neither could, nor would reject it. *Secondly*, it seems inconceivable how the writing and publishing such a Scripture, as was at last written and publish'd, should, without any distincter declaration than the Scripture, by little and little (that is, as People were pleas'd to Copy it out) make valid the hitherto-infallible Authority of this Church: there being in this Scripture twelve Texts at the least (as I have shew'd in the two former Sections) recommending to all, the Authority of the Church; besides, divers others bidding them hold still her Traditions, and inculcating this over and over again; as I shew'd, *Seet. 10. N. 9.* Traditions do not grow weaker, but stronger, by being witnessed also by writing; and the more Authority the Writing ha's, the more strength is added to the former Tradition: For Example, We know by Tradition there is such a place as the *Indies*, where Gold is to be found; but when our own Fleets come to go
thither,

thither, and fetch the Gold from thence, and in Testimony thereof stamp Golden Pieces with this Inscription, *Brought by our Fleet from the Indies*, and when Acts of Parliament come to be set forth concerning the value of such, and such Pieces; when I say this Golden printed Testimony comes forth, is not the former Tradition grown rather more, than become less credible? So when any of the former most credible Traditions come to be now written in the Golden letters of the Scriptures, and of such Scriptures as commanded Traditions to be held, and commanded again and again the Church to be heard, followed, obeyed, relyed upon as the very Pillar and Ground of Truth; is not her Authority and the credit of her Traditions rather increased, than lessened, by this Golden and Divine writing? Again, it was wholly necessary that if after the finishing of the Canon, the Church was no longer to be infallible, that notice thereof, by some very public Decree, or Act, should have been given to all the People in the Church, that they might not go on, grounding their Faith upon the infallible Tradition of this Church, as they did before, lest so doing they should rely now, not upon the Pillar and Ground of Truth, but upon a fallible Authority.

344 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

rity. That this was done you can prove by no kind of Testimony.

3. But I can prove, by a most grave Testimony, that, long after the finishing of the Canon of Scripture, the Faithful Believers still held on their former manner of relying in their whole Faith wholly upon the infallible Authority of the Church; just as I said before, that when *Moses* gave the Scripture to the Jews, the Faithful people among the Gentiles had not these Scriptures, but continued still to believe upon Tradition only (See my first Number,) My Testimony is out of *St. Irenæus*, who was Disciple to *St. Polycarp*, altho' he lived an Hundred and fourscore years after *Christ*. This Saint, in that unquestioned work of his against *Valentinus*, L. 3. C. 4. Where he shews, in what manner we were all to believe the same things which now we do believe, altho' there were no Scripture at all; and he shews this by shewing how, even after the writing of Scripture, many whole Nations did believe, who had never seen the Scripture, by following (as an infallible Rule) that Order of Tradition which had from hand to hand been deliver'd to the Prelates of the Church, and by them to the Churches, of which they respectively had charge. For thus he speaks; *What if the Apostles had not left us*
the

The Church is our infallible Judge. 345

the Scriptures? Must we not have followed that Order of Tradition which they deliver'd to those to whose charge they left the Churches to be Govern'd? To this Order of Tradition (by the unwritten Word) many Barbarous Nations do assent, who have believ'd in Christ without any Writings, keeping diligently the ancient Traditions. Note, that he calls these Traditions *Ancient*, because they had stood a good while after the finishing of the Canon, before which time all Nations believed meerly on Tradition, as I said, and before which time, no one Tradition of Christian Faith could be *Ancient*. Hence then St. *Irenæus* proves, that we might believe with Divine Faith, upon the sole account of, or meerly relying upon, that very Tradition, which the Apostles *de facto* left to those to whom they left the Government of the Church, altho' the Apostles had never written any thing at any time. St. *Irenæus* therefore did believe that the Tradition *de facto* left by the Apostles, was a sufficient ground to uphold Divine and infallible Faith, and consequently that it was infallible: So that upon it meerly, whole Nations might believe: For if he had not thought that they had believed meerly upon Tradition, but had only by it been recommended to take the Scripture for their ground, he could not hence have

346 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

shewed (to shew which he brought this proof) in what measure we had all been obliged to believe all the Points of our Christian Faith, altho' never any Scripture at all had been at any time to be written, in which case it had been impossible for our Belief to have had any kind of Relation to Scripture. And because the Belief of these Nations had no such Relation, this Example was to his purpose, which otherwise had not been so. Now what *St. Irenæus* says must needs in all reason have been true; for the Scripture by the Apostles was only written in Greek, and some very few parts in the Hebrew then currant: A vast multitude of Nations understood not these Languages, as I have shewed *Seet. 1. N. 9.* neither did the Apostles take any care to procure the Scripture to be turned into the Languages of every converted Nation which had a different Tongue; for had they done so, divers of these Translations would either have been for some Ages extant, or at least some memory of them, whereas there is not the least sign of any such thing. The Latin Tongue was by the *Romans* imposed upon most of those many Nations, which were converted in the Apostles Age, and the Ages following; wherefore a Man would think that in the first place, or among the very first, this Language

The Church is our infallible Judge. 347

Language would have been chosen by the Apostles for publishing the Scriptures, if the Scriptures had been the only ground to be relied upon in Faith; yet for all this you will not grant our vulgar Edition (which you grant to be the most Ancient of all Latin Editions) to have been set forth by any Command given by the Apostles, or by any one of their immediate Successors, or to have been approved by them; from hence then we manifestly gather, that the Apostles esteemed that very Tradition, which they deliver'd to these to whom they committed the Government of the Church, to be a most sufficient ground to support infallible Faith: And consequently they held such Traditions infallible, leaving them for the only ground of Faith to the far greater part of the Nations which they converted, to whom they deliver'd no Scripture at all in their own Tongue, nor left any Command (that can be proved) that Scripture should be (presently after the finishing of the Canon) deliver'd to them in their own Language, for had this been done, some of their Translations would have been kept. If you say they had the Scriptures, tho' in Greek only. I Answer, that those who understand not Greek, are never the nearer for having a Greek Book. Why did not St. Peter and
St. Paul

348 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

St. Paul (who writ in Greek even to the *Romans* themselves) at that time they stay'd in the Latin Church, procure or order the Scriptures to be put in Latin; if, without grounding our selves upon Scripture in every point of Belief, no part of our Belief, which is not so grounded, can be infallible. And hence clearly and orderly follows,

4. *My Third reason*, That no Man now has any infallible Faith, but he who relieth upon the Tradition of the present Church, as an infallible ground. This I prove out of what has been by me already demonstrated. First, for the most learned sort that be in the World, they cannot know, by any ground which is infallible, (except the Tradition of the Church be infallible,) which Books the Prophets or Apostles did write, which not, as I have shewed, *Seet. 3.* Nor which be the true uncorrupted Original Copies, which not, as I shewed, *Seet. 4.* and therefore they must rely in these two Points (upon which no less than all their Faith doth rely,) upon the Tradition of the Church as infallible, for a fallible Tradition cannot be a sufficient ground to support an infallible Faith; either then they have no such Faith, or they must allow Tradition to be infallible. As for those who are not so Learned as to understand Hebrew

The Church is our infallible Judge. 349

Hebrew and Greek, or who have not means to know which Copies be uncorrupted in Greek or Hebrew; they must believe this but by meer human Authority, if they refuse the Churches Tradition: So by and by, *N. 7.* And so for Translations, which be the very prime conveyers of all that is in Scripture, to those who understand not Greek and Hebrew, either these Men must rely upon the Word of God, as convey'd unto them by such fallible Men, as I have shewed their Translators to be, *Seet. 5.* or, far more wisely, they must rely upon the Tradition of the Church as infallible; and if they do not, their Faith will ever be fallible, as I have shewed. Again, it is not the bare Letter of Scripture which can be a Rule or Ground of Faith unto us, but it is the sense of this Letter interpreted according to the true mind of the Holy Ghost: Now the private interpretation, which any particular Mans Wit, or Learning, or Spirit can give to this bare Letter, is fallible; even tho' he shall exactly observe those Twenty several Rules of which I spake, *Seet. 7. N. 7.* for these Rules are all fallible; wherefore the bare Letter, taken in the sense that we, by our private Wit, Learning, and Spirit imagin, and meerly conjecture it to be taken, is not the infallible sense of the Holy Ghost,
and

and therefore no Ground of Faith, even to those most Learned Men who are able to use exactly all those Twenty Rules. See the place last cited. But as for all that vast Multitude which cannot understand perfectly Hebrew and Greek, it is impossible for them to observe those Twenty Rules (of which one supposeth perfect skill in Hebrew and Greek;) Wherefore it being our Adversaries own Doctrin, That, without the exact observance of all these 20 Rules, the infallible sense of the Holy Ghost cannot be infallibly known to any one, but only fallibly; after all that still fallible industry, it is a clear demonstration, that those who know not Greek and Hebrew, cannot know infallibly what the Scripture bids them do or believe; they not being able infallibly to know the sense of the bare Letter, which sense (you say) is the only Rule and Direction of Faith, and the only infallible Ground upon which all Divine Faith must rely. Wherefore almost all Mankind, who is unskilful in Greek and Hebrew, must first have, not only the Letter of the Scripture faithfully deliver'd unto them upon trust of the Translators; But Secondly, this must be done after that these Translators have made an unquestionable choice of sure uncorrupted Original Copies, (in which choice it is not possible
for

The Church is our infallible Judge. 351

for them to proceed, but very fallibly as I shewed *Seet. 5.*) Thirdly, Also they must have the Sense of the Letter deliver'd truly and assuredly unto them. I ask, by whom? You say, by your Ministers. Then (say I) you rely upon the Wit, Skill and Spirit of those Ministers. Is this proved infallible? No. How then is your Faith infallible? As for us, we rely upon the unanimous Tradition of those Governors of our Churches, to whom the Apostles, with that Charge, deliver'd all the important Points of our Faith, as well by Word of Mouth, as by Daily Practice answerable thereunto; commanding them to deliver to all in their Churches (among whom were their future Successors) the same Points both by Word of Mouth, and by the Answerable Practice, just as they had received. In like manner their Successors successively were directed and commanded to proceed. No Writing (as I shall shew, *Seet. 19. N. 4. 5. 6. &c.*) can with so full assuredness, bring down to our Age, what was Taught and Practised in the first Age, as perpetual Tradition of the same Doctrin, confirmed by the continuance of the same Practice first received, and never able to be shewed to have been altered or changed. Upon this Tradition, we are sure, that we believe as
ground-

352 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*
groundedly, at the least, as all the true Believers did for the first Two thousand years before any Scripture was written: And as groundedly as all the Gentiles (for only Jews had the Scripture) believed at any time afterwards: And as groundedly as the Jews believed still somethings only upon Tradition: For Example; What remedy was to be used to take away Original Sin from their Female Children, or from their Male Children, dying before their Circumcision on the Eighth day? And gain, as groundedly as those many Nations, converted by the Apostles Successors, believed after the Scripture was finished, tho' they never had so much as seen Scripture, but wholly relyed in their whole Belief upon the *ancient Tradition received from them, from whom the Governors of their Churches had Originally received their Governments and Authority*; to wit, from the Apostles; as I shewed out of *S. Irenæus*. Tradition then of these Governors of our Churches, deliver'd unanimously by them, makes the Points so deliver'd, now as evidently credible, and as fit Objects of divine Faith, as it made the Points, deliver'd then by their Governors or Pastors: Wherefore we have as good Reason now, to take what is thus proposed for Truth, revealed by God, to be indeed so; and consequently

sequently to be imbraced with so firm and immoveable adhesion of Understanding and Will; that the Preaching of the contrary by an Angel from Heaven, should not stagger our Belief therein: And we have as good Reason to proceed thus in our Belief, as all those I spoke of, had to proceed so in their Belief.

5. My fourth Reason hence deduced, is, that Christ himself expects and exacts an infallible assent of Faith to be given to any Point, which is confirm'd by Miracle from Heaven; and such an Assent, has a sufficient Ground to support its Infallibility. *Christ calls these Miracles a Testimony greater than John, Mark 5.* Yea, a Testimony (in order to us) greater than his own Word, *If you will not believe me, believe my Works.* He calls that a kind of sure knowledge, which is grounded on the Testimony of a Miracle; So *Mat. 9. v. 6. But that you may know, that the Son of Man hath power on Earth to forgive Sins,* he saith to the Man sick of the Palsie, *Arise, take up thy Bed, and go into thine House.* You see *Christ* used the Testimony of this one Miracle, as sufficient to make them know the truth of his having Power to forgive Sins. Miracles then ground a sure knowledge of Faith, or an infallible Assent to what they confirm: But the Tradition of the Church, makes that which
it

it witnesseth to be as infallible, and as evidently credible in order to us, as this curing of the Man Sick of the Palsie, or any such Miracle can do: Therefore this Tradition may be as solid a Ground of an infallible Assent, as a Miracle: I prove it clearly thus, Let any Man speak as he thinks in the sight of God, and he will plainly confess that to be most true, which I am going to say; I say then, that tho' a Man had lived in the Country all his life, and never had seen *London*, yet he (meerly upon the Testimony of Tradition) would so fully believe, that there is such a City as *London*, and that it is the Head Town of *England*; that neither I nor you, can prudently conceive, how the Testimony of any one Miracle (wrought on purpose, to prove that there is such a City as *London*) should make it more evidently credible unto him, that there is such a City, without the Testimony of any Tradition, than Tradition has made it without the Testimony of any Miracle: Whence you see Tradition wins Belief as powerfully, as any Miracle. True it is, this Tradition we spoke of, is but Human, and so be the Motives of Credibility, making it evidently credible, that God by his Apostles, affirm'd such or such a Point unto the first Believers of the Church. But when it is
once

once made to me as evidently credible , that God ha's revealed such and such Verities , as it is credible by Human Tradition , that there is such a City as *London*, then presently (by the Grace of God) I conclude ; that it being so credible, that God has said such and such a thing, that I cannot in prudence no more doubt that he hath said it , than I can doubt there is such a City as *London*: I being thus assured , am by my Duty to God , bound to yield that submission of my Understanding to this saying of God, which is fit to be yielded to the Word of God , which Word cannot (without Blasphemous Impiety) be held subject to the least Fallibility. And therefore, what by Tradition is made so evidently credible to me , to have been revealed by God to this Church; ought to be accepted by me, as the Word of God. Whence I ought to account it Blasphemous Impiety to doubt of the truth of it ; and consequently, I ought to hold it infallible , and as far from all possibility of being false, as Gods Word is. And being that this very self same Tradition tells me , that the same God, who revealed by his Apostles , so many other Verities to his Church , did also reveal, by the same Apostles, to the same Church, that this Church was to be heard as the Mistris of Truth , with whom he would

356 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

would ever be present, suggesting her all Truth, and never permitting the Gates of Hell to prevail against her; but that he placed her as a Pillar, and Ground of Truth, giving her such Pastors, as should secure her Children from being tossed to and fro with every Wind of Doctrine; being (I say) this very self same Tradition, which made it evidently credible unto me, that God had revealed many other Verities to his Church, had also (together with them) reveal'd this Verity, of her being infallible, in proposing any Point for Divine Faith; and being that I did see with my Eyes, that she did propose her Traditions for Verities received from God, it could not but be evidently credible unto me, that God had revealed the Infallibility of his Church, and consequently, the questionless Truth of her Traditions. Wherefore I yielded that submission of my Understanding to this saying of God, which was fit to be yielded to the Word of God, which Word I could not without Blaspheinous Impiety, suspect to be any way liable to Fallibility.

6. Here, by the way, out of what has been now said, we may easily clear two common difficulties: The first is, how we commit no vicious Circle in our Faith: For tho' first, we believe the Scripture to
be

The Church is our infallible Judge. 357

be Gods Word ; because the Church , which is infallible , told us so : Yet , when again we are asked , why we first believed the Church to be infallible ? We do not say (as our Adversaries would needs make us say , whether we would or no) That we first believe our Church to be infallible , because the Scripture told us the Church was infallible . But we answer , that we first believe the Church to be infallible by her Tradition , deliver'd her by the Apostles , before any Scripture was made ; which Tradition makes things so evidently credible , as I have just now declared , that even a Miracle wrought purposely , to confirm such a Point , makes not that Point more evidently credible . Tradition therefore is a Ground able to support an infallible Assent . Well then , I believe *Christ* to have been Crucified , because the Scripture saith so ; I believe the Scripture , because the Church by her Tradition , saith the Scripture to be Gods Word ; I believe the Church , and her Tradition , for its own credibility . If you ask me why I do so ? I answer , because I will do prudently in a Matter of so great consequence ; that is , I will submit , and I will captivate my Understanding in such a manner ; as to yield all firm Assent , which (by Gods Grace) I possibly can do unto that , which the Church
by

358 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

by her Tradition proposeth unto me as Gods true Word; upon which Word my Understanding shall be fix'd so immoveably, that no *Angels* words shall move me from it: See *Sect. 23. N. 5, 6.* Hence you see to what my Understanding cleaveth so fast; to wit, to Gods true Word propos'd by the Church, or her unanimous Tradition. Now if you ask me; why my Will is so resolute in making choice of thus submitting, and thus captivating my Understanding? I easily answer, Because my Understanding ha's evidently seen (I do not then go blindly to work, as our Adversaries conceive we all do, *Sect. 8.*) that even according to all Reason, Prudence, and Piety, it is most unreasonable, imprudent and impious, not to yield this submission of Understanding to that which is evidently credible to be Gods Word; and that to the full as that which is confirm'd by Miracle: For what is affirm'd by the Churches unanimous Tradition, is no less evidently credible than what is confirm'd by Miracle, (as I prov'd in the very last Number;) Therefore (and in many other respects) it is most unreasonable, most imprudent, and impious, not to yield all possible submission of Understanding to that

The Church is our infallible Judge. 359

that which is propos'd as Gods Word, by the unanimous Tradition of the Church. It is madness not to believe what is made evidently credible, even then when Heaven is offer'd unto me, if I will believe it, and when Hell is infallibly to be my punishment, if I will not believe it. For so our Saviour himself said, when Men had only Tradition to rely on (to wit, before any word of that new Scripture was written) *He that believes and is Baptiz'd shall be sav'd; but he that believes not shall be damn'd.* (Mark 16. v. 15.) And many were damn'd for not believing the Church, before either the Old Scripture was written in the Law of Nature, and before the finishing of the New Testament in the first seventy years after *Christs* Passion; and after the finishing of it also, many were damn'd for not believing among those Nations to whom the Faith without any Scripture was so well propos'd, that thousands of them were most true Believers, meerly grounding their whole Faith upon the Church and her unanimous Tradition.

7. The Second difficulty (which may easily be clear'd by what ha's been here said) is, how the ignorant vulgar sort come to imbrace our Faith, and all the Points of it, with an infallible Assent, and that prudently? Whence will appear,

360 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

pear that Tradition is the fittest deliverer of certain Truths; and the most proportionable to the capacity of the incomparably greater part of the World. For no Man, who is above the degree of a Fool, is so ignorant, but by such careful search, as all are bound to use in finding out the way to their last end (which is Eternal Salvation;) he will presently find, that the unanimous Tradition of our present Church proposeth such and such Points to be believ'd as being Points reveal'd by *Christ's Apostles* to the Church: For Example; *The Trinity, the Incarnation, the Death and Resurrection of our Saviour, his having planted upon Earth an Infallible Church for our direction, &c.* Then having found this to be the unanimous consent, and Tradition of our Church, he may easily be made capable how evidently credible that is which is propos'd by the Tradition of such a Church. First, because all those who believ'd for the first two thousand years, did believe all that they believ'd upon a weaker Tradition than this is, as I discours'd before. Secondly, he may also easily understand how true it is which I said, N. 5. That no Miracle can move a Man so effectually to believe, that there is such a place as *London*, as Tradition do's move him thereunto; wherefore as Miracles can beget an infallible

The Church is our Infallible Judge. 361

fallible Assent, so also may Tradition. Thirdly, He can understand, that the Churches Tradition is secur'd by God, from deceiving us; for else, all the Faith of those Millions and Millions (to whom God gave no other ground but this to ground that Faith, which he, under pain of Damnation, exacted of them) might have been an Error; and could not have been infallible, as he exacted their Faith should be. Now all this being most true, and being also a real proposal of what is indeed reveal'd by God (which it is not when any false Church useth this Argument) God can, and will concur with this ignorant Man, as well as with any Doctor, to raise him by supernatural Grace to an infallible Assent to the Truth, which he embrac'd most prudently upon Reasons proportionable to his Capacity; which Reasons do really make the Verities which he believes, to be first evidently credible to him. His Faith may then be truly infallible, tho' he knows not that it is infallible; for this Knowledge is no way necessary even in learned Men, as I shall say, *Señ. 23*. Now among our Sectaries, ignorant Men can never imbrace the Points of Faith with an infallible Assent. For they must imbrace no Point with such an Assent, but when the Scripture, not taken according

362 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

to the bare Letter, but taken as interpreted truly, tells them that such a Point is true. But I ask how it can ever be made evidently credible to them, that such a place of Scripture is truly interpreted in that Sense? But especially seeing that the greatest Protestant Doctors teach, That the true Sense cannot be found out but by observing perhaps twenty Rules, of which they are by them plainly told, that they cannot observe divers, as I noted just now, N. 4. whence it is clear they may and must despair of finding amongst you any true ground fit to support an infallible Assent. This your own prime Doctors did easily see, and knew not how to deny. Hence *Whitaker de Sacra Scriptura*, Q. 5. C. 9. Eighthly, *Because the unskilful know not rightly to use these means* (of consulting the Hebrew and Greek Originals) *they must go to those who are more skilful*: So he. And your great Divine *Baronius in Apodixi*, P. 47. *The unlearn'd Laymen cannot have a certain and explicate, and distinct knowledge of the Scriptures, and of the Doctrin contain'd in the Scriptures, or that the Translated Bible agrees with the Original Edition. Yea, they do not know but by the testimony of others, that the Doctrin which is propos'd to them to be believ'd, is contain'd in this Bible. And again, P. 48. They only by Human Faith believe,*
that

The Church is our infallible Judge. 363
that the Doctrin which is propos'd to them is contain'd in the Bible. So he. You then, who are not perfectly skill'd in Hebrew and Greek, are taught by your own Doctors, that it is impossible for you to believe, but upon trust and reliance on the Authority of some more skilful. Do you not know evidently these on whom you rely, to be fallible? Yes. Why then, know evidently, that your Belief amongst Protestants, can never rise to be infallible, nor so much as evidently credible, even to the ignorant; for they are sure, that as your Ministers say, such and such Protestant Doctrin is evidently by them deduc'd out of the Word of God; so they are sure, that a far greater and learneder number of the present Age, and all the whole numberless number of those who liv'd these last Ten Ages before your Reformation, who were Men most vertuous and most learn'd, did unanimously affirm the quite contrary Doctrin to be conformable to Scripture rightly understood. And this they know by your own confession: For you never deny that Popish Doctrin was the currant Doctrin of all Christians these last Thousand years, excepting only such Christians as were notorious Heretics, or some few others, who make no number at all fit to appear in the view of

364 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

so many Millions of Millions as these ordinary Laymen know to have most constantly imbrac'd the *Roman* Faith; and, with a vast multitude of Books, to have most learnedly maintain'd the Doctrin flatly contrary to yours, to be the more conformable to Scripture; in which they liv'd with far more Sanctity than now you do; why then should I now forsake that, which is also confirm'd (as you acknowledge) by many great Councils; and choose to venture my Soul with these new Believers, whom I, and every ignorant Man knows to go to a Church every *Sunday*, the very Walls of which Church are many years older than their Religion? If they will go with us the old beaten Way, trodden by all Antiquity, and chalked out by an uninterrupted Tradition from the Apostles days to these, they (as ignorant as they are) may, as I said, easily come to see, First, That they shall have as sure Ground for all their whole Belief, as all true Believers had the first two thousand years before the Scripture was written. Secondly, They shall see they have as sure a Ground as all true Believers (the *Jews* at the most excepted) had for those two thousand years following, before other Nations had the Scripture. Thirdly, They shall see, that they have as sure
Ground

The Church is our infallible Judge. 365

Ground as all Christians are confess'd to have had the first Seventy years before the New Testament was finish'd and divulg'd. Fourthly, They shall see they have as sure Ground as those many Nations had, who believ'd all that other Christians did, and believ'd it with as true a Divine Faith, tho' they never did see Scripture; as I said even now out of the most Ancient Doctor *St. Irenaeus*. So that they see that the Ground of their Belief has been a most sure Ground of true divine infallible Faith for above more than four thousand years, to wit, a good way downward after *Christ's* time. Fifthly, They see also, that the last thousand years, which was just before your Reformation, all those vast multitudes, whom you confess to have followed Popery, to have still believ'd on the same Ground relying on the present Church as infallible: Therefore from *Christ's* time to the Reformation they see only a wonderful short space of years, in which space you say all refus'd to rely in their Belief upon the Church: What, is this space to be compar'd to that almost whole space of time which was from the beginning of the World to this Reformation; in all which vast space all Faith of all Men rely'd on the Church as infallible? Again (as simple as I am) I

R 3 . understand

366 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

understand this eyident Argument, that in the Thousand years just before your Reformation there were many Councils, many learn'd, and many very holy Men (for they say, that then Men generally rather liv'd better than now). Now these Councils, these great numbers of learn'd and holy Men could not but see the Truth of those matters which are clearly and plainly set down in Scripture; and even the Protestants themselves teach, that all necessary matters are clearly and plainly set down in Scripture: I therefore neither have Charity nor Wit, if I say that they then could not see the Truth, so manifestly clear in such Points; wherefore upon good Reason in those Points I will agree with the *Roman* Catholics: But now, for those Points which are not clear in Scripture, I will also not disagree from them; because, in things confessedly not clear, you are likelier to misunderstand Scripture than they: And they (besides Scripture) give me that excellent sure Ground of the Tradition of the Church, which has been a sure Ground for so many Thousand years, and questionless is a surer Ground than trusting you; I will then, in these Points, trust them, and not you. And so you see why I resolve in all Points to trust the Church. But all this

is

The Church is our infallible Judge. 367

is spoken by the way; now let us go on.

8. My Fifth Reason for the Infallibility of some means in the Church sufficient to ground Divine Faith, and yet differing from Scripture, is this, God has given us some Means sufficient to come to the Faith necessary to Salvation (as has been prov'd *Quest. 1.*) But this Means is not the Scripture (as I have shew'd in the twelve first Sections;) neither is it natural Reason (as I shew'd, *Sect. 13.*) Therefore the Means which now actually are given us by God, are the infallible direction of the Church; there being not the least appearance of probability for any other Means which God has given us, tho' he might have given us other Means, if he had pleas'd.

9. My Sixth Reason is, that whatsoever was held by the Universal Church, was without farther questioning, held for true; and the contrary to it was ever rejected as an Error; two manifest signs of Infallibility; both which will appear sufficiently prov'd, when I shall come to cite the Fathers Authority for the Infallibility of the Church, *Sect. 20, 21, 22.* and you know already St. *Austins* saying in the end of his Book *de Hæresibus*, that tho' he tells you not in particular, what the Church has defin'd against every one of those several Heresies, yet saith

368 *The Church is our infallible Judge.*

he, *Sufficit eam contra ista sentire, It is enough* (to make us fly them as Heresies) *to know that the Church holds the contrary.* Neither will you ever find any Catholic who ever had the boldness to say, that all the Church of his days did universally hold any thing that was an Error: And their Works were conformable; for never shall you read of any Catholic (much less of any Holy Father) who refus'd to conform himself to the universal Belief and Practice which was current in the whole Church of their times; your *Luther* and *Calvin* had not their Spirit. Here I intreat you to read the Authorities which hereafter I shall bring out of the Fathers, and you shall see the sense and feeling which Sacred Antiquity had in this Point: See my *Sett.* 20. &c. How close in all Interpretation of Scripture (on which all depends) Antiquity did ever stand to the Church, I have said *Sett.* 7 N. 9. out of *Vincentius Lirinensis.*

10. My Seventh Reason is, That without the Church be provided of some other infallible Means to direct us to the Truth, besides Scripture; there will never be any Unity and Agreement in the Church, in necessary Points of Religion. For I have already fully shew'd, that Scripture alone (tho' submitted unto by
all

all sides) do's not produce this Unity, even in necessary Points; for I have numbred up twenty four such Points not so much as contain'd in Scripture. Hence I frame this Argument; Under pain of Damnation all are bound to agree in this one thing, that all and every one interiorly gives an infallible Assent to all such Points as are necessary to be believ'd for the attaining of Salvation; because all are bound to please God, and consequently to have that Faith *without which it is impossible to please God*: But all can never be brought to agree in this one thing (that all, and every one of them interiorly gives an infallible Assent to all such Points as are necessarily to be believ'd for attaining Salvation) without all and every one submit their Assent to some other infallible Rule besides Scripture; for submitting to Scripture only do's not produce this Union, as so long and so lamentable Experience has taught us: Neither can the Scripture alone suffice for this end, being it do's not so much as contain twenty four of such Points as are all necessary to Salvation: Therefore all can never be brought to agree in that one thing (in which, under pain of Damnation they must agree) without they all and every one interiorly give an infallible Assent to some other

370 *The Church is our Infallible Judge.*

Rule of Faith than the Scripture : No other, with any appearance of Reason, can be thought of, but the direction of the Church ; therefore her direction is this Rule. But if her direction be this Rule, her direction must needs be infallible ; and this for two very manifest Reasons. The first is, That it is impossible all should be (as they are) bound under pain of Damnation to follow this Rule, if this Rule could guide them into Error : Because it is impossible God should damn Men, for not following so foul an Error as this is, which makes them father as many Lies upon God as they believe Errors to be Divine Verities. The Second Reason is, because all (as I said) are bound interiorly to give an infallible Assent to all such Points as are propos'd by the Church : But it is impossible to give an infallible Assent, grounded upon a ground which is not infallible (as it is clear :) Therefore seeing that the Ground, upon which their Belief in these Points must rely, is only the meer direction of the Church ; it evidently follows, that her direction is infallible. Why I defer to answer the Objections against the Infallibility of the Church, and some other things, I shall presently tell you.

QUEST.

QUEST. IV.

Which is that Church which is the infallible Judge in all Controversies? How she exercises her infallible Judgment? And what submission is due thereunto?

I. **H**ITHERTO we have only in general declar'd the Church to be our Judge, and to be provided of some intallible Means (besides Scripture) to guide and direct us in Faith; not intermeddling with other important, but more particular doubts; until we had gotten sufficient Principles solidly establish'd, to proceed to these Particulars with more clear and distinct Knowledge. By the Church, we have hitherto understood, that Blessed Congregation of People which follow'd the Doctrin of *Christ* and his Disciples, still propagating the Doctrin deliver'd to them from Age to Age, until we come to our Age. But because there be a number of Congregations pretending to be this Blessed Congregation; we must see in particular, in which of them we can find this infallible Means to end all Controversies, and to direct us securely

curely in all Points of Faith. Secondly, We must see in what particular manner this particular blessed Congregation do's judge all Controversies; and how she directs us in particular in all our doubts of Faith. When we have found these two things, we shall soon see the last thing we seek for, to wit, what particular Submission is due from all, that they all may be securely directed in that Faith which leads to eternal Salvation; the end for which we all were created; and consequently, at which all our most serious endeavours ought to aim.

2. And because we now shall come to speak of the *Roman Church*, and to shew how she in her General Councils, proposing unto her self the Word of God, as well written as unwritten, do's issue forth her Definitions, Decrees and Orders by which she directs us: We only now can clearly dispatch some things, which very properly belong'd to the last Question, but could not be so commodiously treated there, because they requir'd a more distinct knowledge of the Questions to be handled here. Here then we shall solve the Objections against the Infallibility of the Church, which our Adversaries use to make against the *Roman Church* in particular; and therefore they were to be treated

treated here. Here also we must Answer many things they bring against Councils; and when we declare how Councils propose to themselves Gods Word Written, and Unwritten, we must add somewhat more of Tradition than has yet been said, Answering what else they object against it. And because the Testimonies of the Holy Fathers, confirming the Infallibility of the Church, do sometimes speak of her Infallibility in general, sometimes they speak of the *Roman Church's* Infallibility in particular; sometimes how infallible general Councils are; sometimes how infallible the unwritten Traditions of the Church are (which meerly rely on her Authority:) We have thought good to place their Testimonies after that we have treated of all these particulars, which are linked together with so necessary connexion one of another; that the proof of the one, is the proof of the other.

Sect. 17.

Whether the Roman Church be that Church which is our infallible Judge?

I. **BY** the *Roman Church*, we do not understand the particular Diocess of *Rome*; but we understand, that vastly extended.

tended Community of Christians which hold Communion with the Church of *Rome*, submitting themselves to the Bishop of *Rome* as to their Head; so that whatsoever he Decrees with a general Council, they imbrace as the Definition of the true Church, which they hold infallible. This is *the Flock of Christ adhering to the true Shepherd* appointed by him, as I shall shew *Sect. 20. N. 6.* Wherefore when you come now in particular to see into what we resolve our Faith, when we say that we rely upon the Church as infallible; you shall find that it is resolved finally into the Authority of God proposing such and such things to us to be believed by this his Church, whose mind is made known unto us, partly by such Traditions as universally go currant in her, and are most notoriously known, not only to be permitted, but also to be on all occasions unanimously taught by her Prelates, and partly by such Definitions and Decrees, as the Prelates of the Church, lawfully assembled by Order of, and together with their Head, do set forth; of which manner of Government we shall speak in the next Sections.

2. We then constantly affirm, the *Roman Church* thus understood is our infallible Judge in all our Controversies of Faith, and appointed by God to be so.

The

The proof of this is easily and demonstratively perform'd, supposing the Truth of all that has been said and proved in the last Question, in which both out of Old and New Testament, I have brought most convincing Testimonies, to prove that God has appointed some Church upon Earth to be our infallible Judge. The same I proved by several Reasons in the last Section. So that we do not, without full proof, suppose that God has appointed some Church upon Earth to be our infallible Judge. This then (upon good proof) supposed; we easily demonstrate this Church appointed by God for our Judge, to be the *Roman*, and only the *Roman* Church; we do it thus: The *Protestant* Church, and all other Churches different from the *Roman*, do judge, do declare, and profess themselves to be fallible, even according to the infallible word of God; If then the *Protestant* Church, or any other Churches different from the *Roman*, be infallible in all that they judge, and in that they declare and profess to be true, even according to the Word of God, they doubtless are then infallible, and speak then the infallible Truth; when they judge, and declare and profess, that even according to the Word of God, they are infallible: Therefore infallibly they are fallible.

Hence

Hence again, it being thus proved, that no Church different from the *Roman* is infallible; and it being formerly prov'd that God has appointed some Church upon Earth to be our infallible Judge: It demonstratively follows, that the *Roman* Church must needs be this infallible Judge; because no Church different from the *Roman* (that is, none but the *Roman*) can be this infallible Church, as my former Argument proved. Some of our Adversaries are pleas'd fondly to mistake this Argument, as if we argued thus, The *Roman* Church claims Infallibility: Therefore she must needs have right to it. This Argument we give our Adversaries free leave to scoff at, as much as they please; it is nothing like ours, we put all the force of our Argument in this, That the Church, truly appointed by God for infallible Judge of Controversies, cannot possibly be any of those Churches which teach themselves not to be this infallible Judge, because they teach themselves to be fallible: If then they be infallible in the Doctrin they teach, they are infallible when they teach themselves to be fallible: Whence it follows that infallibly they are fallible. The Church which is truly appointed by God to be infallible Judge, must needs have this condition, That she do's own her Infallibility:

But

But this far is from saying, that meerly the owning of Infallibility do's make Infallibility her own. It is a very different thing to say, *he that must be a Minister, must needs be a Man, and not a Woman*; and to say, *that such an one must needs be a Minister because he is a Man, and not a Woman*; so it is one thing to say, the Church which is the infallible Judge, must be a Church judging, and holding, and professing her self to be infallible; and cannot be a Church which judgeth and professeth her self to be fallible: And another quite different thing to say, That such a Church is the infallible Judge, because she teacheth and professeth her self to be so.

3. Others have in exceeding plenty alledged other Arguments which may be seen in them; this one being a Demonstration serves my turn, and this one being put alone, I hope my Reader will more mark the force of it.

Sect. 18.

In what Court this infallible Judge decideth our Controversies in Faith.

1. **O**ur Adversaries would make the World believe (as may be seen in Dr. Fern's, Sect. 17.) that they have a great

great Advantage against us, when they put this Question to us; for by putting it they conceive they put us at Variance with one another, because some will say, *First*, The Pope can infallibly by himself, out of a Council, decide all Controversies; others will say, *Secondly*, That a Council can do this without a Pope. But I must tell them that, *Thirdly*, All and every one of us (without the least disagreement) do and will unanimously say, That all those Definitions declare an infallible Truth, which are set forth by the Pope defining together with a general Council. Any one way of defining infallibly is enough, and is sufficient to end any Controversies: Yield but to this one way, and we will press you no further. If you will not yield to the Pope defining jointly with a Council, we are sure enough that you will neither yield to Pope alone, nor Council alone. If God has provided us of one way, which is a sure and infallible way to know any necessary Point of Faith, and to keep us all in settled Unity, concerning all matters declar'd by this infallible Authority (such as we all hold this Authority to be :) It is impossible that we should want necessary Direction, or a sufficient means to maintain that Unity which is necessary for the Church, or that guidance which

is necessary for our Salvation. If their Opinion be true who say, the Definition of the Pope alone is sufficiently infallible to do this without a Council; these Men furnish us with two means of necessary direction; for they do not destroy, but maintain the former; because no Man is so senseless as to hold the Definitions of the Pope to be infallible without a Council, and to be fallible with one. So also no Man is so senseless as to say, that Councils Definitions are infallible without a Pope; and that they are not infallible when Councils define together with the Pope. But these Men who say, Councils defining even without a Pope, are infallible, do also add a Third means of infallible direction. The one means I speak of is allowed by every one, and this one means is sufficient for every one. You see then, this disagreement gives you not the least advantage to deny the Infallibility of the *Roman Church*, as long as by this name we understand continually, either this Church speaks by Universal Tradition, or the Church representative, by which we understand the Bishop of *Rome* our Supream Pastor defining with a Lawful general Council. The Infallibility of the Church, thus understood, is a Point of Catholic Faith; the other are Opinions of Catholic Divines, all who agree

agree in the exacting the Belief of the Infallibility of the Church taken in this sense as we still take it.

2. If you ask us then, not our Opinions, but our Belief, (I pray mark this distinction:) We all Unanimously agree, that the Supream Bishop of the Church, or Pope, defining with a general Council, is the infallible Judge of Controversies. And it cannot seem strange to any Christian, that the same God, who gave an infallible Assistance to *Solomon* (who proved an Idolater) that the Church might enjoy the benefit of his Books, should give either the Supream Pastor of the Church, or the Church Representative, for that particular time, his infallible Assistance, that all the Church might enjoy so great a benefit as is the secure direction in all Points of Faith, and the perpetual preservation in Unity of Faith, not to be had sufficiently by any other means that is given unto us. Yea, who can choose but think it strange, that *Christ*, for the secure direction of all the first Christians converted only in the Apostles days, should give this Infallibility to all, and every one of the Apostles; and that he should regard so little the secure direction of all that infinite number of Christians, who were to be converted after the Apostles times to the very

very end of the World, that for their sakes, and for the secure direction of their Souls, and their preservation in Unity of Faith, he would not give this Infallibility so much as to one only Man? No nor to the Church Representative in a full Council, even for that short time in which they are to pass their Decrees concerning the most important Affairs in Christendom? Especially seeing that on the one side, this gift of Infallibility is given, not for their private sakes to whom it is given; but it is given for the universal Good, and necessary Direction, Concord, and perpetual Unity of the whole Church: And on the other side, that, even now after we have Scripture, the necessity of this Infallibility is so great, that our Adversaries with Dr. Fern, *Sect. 17.* do confess, *That such a Judge or Umpire of Christendom (as a Council indued with Infallibility) would (if so be had) be a ready means to compose all differences, and restore Truth and Peace.* Is it then strange that God should give so necessary a gift, or a gift so beneficial to his Church?

3. Having now, by all said in the former Discourses, proved that the Church diffused, or Universal, was furnished by God with some infallible means, besides Scripture, to direct all securely in Faith, and to preserve them in Unity,
by

by the true decision of all their Controversies; we have found already enough to perswade any prudent Man, to seek after the particular manner by which this means is to be applicable, and serviceable unto him. Now this is easily understood by that manner of Government which we had here in *England*, from the Conquest to our days; according to which, all the Decrees and Ordinances by which we were govern'd or directed, were to be made by a lawful King jointly with a lawful Parliament. This Representative, and their Decrees are call'd the Decrees of the Kingdom. Just so, the particular manner by which the Church diffused or universal is directed and govern'd, is by a lawful Pope, as supreme Pastor, jointly with a lawful Council: And this Assembly is call'd the Church Representative, and their Decrees are call'd the Decrees of the Church. This way you shall find to have been very connatural to the Church: For it was impossible, that the Church universal, or diffused should be assembled for the making the Decrees. And tho' Children and Women belong to the Church, yet all easily see, that the Church Government belongs not to them; neither is their Vote (in any Mans Opinion) requir'd for the decision

tion in Controversies of Faith: We say also, that the Laity hath no decisive Voice in this Point; they are Sheep and not Pastors. Every inferior Clergyman is not a considerable Governor in the Church: This Government then belongs to such as are Prelates, Overseers, and Governors over the rest, *Bishops plac'd by the Holy Ghost over all the Flock, to feed (or govern) the Church of God, Act. 20. v. 28.* For not Lay-Magistrates, but only Ecclesiastical are said, (*Eph. 4.*) *To be given us by Christ for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying the Body of Christ, that henceforth we may not be carried about with every wind of Doctrin, &c.* It was not to a Lay-Magistrate, but to a Bishop to whom Christ said, *Feed my Sheep, Jo. 21. v. 15.* It is worth the Readers knowledge to relate here (out of *Rufinus, l. 10.* and *Caranza's Sum*, just before the Council of Nice) how the first General Council was assembled in the days of the first Christian Emperor *Constantine the Great.* *Rufinus* then, having related how the Heresie of *Arius* growing up to the ruin of Christendom, *Constantine the great, ex sententia Sacerdotum*, by the Advice or Judgment of the Priests, did call together *Episcopale Concilium*, a Council of Bishops, to judge of the Propositions and Questions of *Arius*. Behold their Power of
Judicature

Judicature acknowledg'd by their calling, and coming, and sitting; for they were call'd, did come and sit, for no other end, but to end Controversies by their Judgment. And then he tells us, how these Bishops beginning to give up in writing Complaints against one another to the Emperor; he putting all those Papers in his Bosom, without ever opening or looking upon them, said to the Bishops, *God has appointed you Priests, and given you power even to judge of us also; and therefore we are rightly judg'd by you; but you (speaking of them as a whole Council) cannot be judg'd by Men; wherefore expect only the Judgment of God upon you; and that your complaints, whatever they be, may be reserv'd to the Examina of God. For you are given unto us by God, as Gods (that is, Judges in his place;) It is not convenient that Men should judge the Gods; but he alone of whom it is written, (Psal. 82.) God standeth in the Congregation of the Gods. He judgeth among the Gods. Constantin having said this; he commanded all those Papers to be burnt. And, when now the Sentence of the Council, defining that the Son of God was Consubstantial to his Father, was brought to him, *Ille tanquam a Deo prolatam veneratur, &c.* that is, *He did reverence this Sentence as pronounc'd by God himself; and if any one should offer to go against it,*
be*

he protests he will banish him as a Man going against the Divine Statutes.

4. Behold here how the Decrees of Councils ought to be reverenc'd as Divine. Hence St. *Athanasius* in *Epist. ad Episcop. Africanos*, after this self same Definition, said, *The word of God by the Nicene Council do's remain for ever and ever.* Hence St. *Hormisdas* C. *Sic ille Dist. 58.* saith, *We believe that in them (the Fathers of this Council) the Holy Ghost did speak.* Hence St. *Cyril* (in the Council of *Ephesus Tom. 1. Ep. 1.*) speaks thus of the Fathers of the Council of *Nice*, *They, lest they should swerve from Truth, being inspir'd by the Holy Ghost (because it was not they which did speak, but the Spirit of God and the Father who did speak in them, as Christ our Saviour protesteth) have set forth the Rule of pure and unblamable Faith.* So he, and the Parenthesis also is his. His also are these words, *How can it be doubted but that Christ did preside invisibly in that Holy and Great Council?* *Epist. ad Anastas. Alexandrinum.* St. *Leo* (whom I shall cite by and by) saith, *That what this Council defines, it did seal by the Holy Ghost.* St. *Isidore*, in the Preface to his Collection of Canons, not only recommends what the first Four Councils have defin'd, but saith also of the Decrees of other Councils; *That they stand firmly settled in all vigor, which the holy Fathers full of the*

holy Ghost, have establish'd. Mark how common it is to ascribe the Decrees of the Councils to the assistance of the Holy Ghost, to whom to ascribe any thing that might be an Error, is a great Sacrilege. Alio St. Leo, Ep. 84. ad Anast. calls the Canons of the Holy Fathers made by the Spirit of God, consecrated by the reverence given to them by the whole World. And Ep. 73. he saith, The Council of Chalcedon was assembled by the holy Ghost, that their Definitions were a Rule proceeding from Divine Inspiration. Hence St. Ambrose speaking of the Heretics condemn'd by a Council, Lib. de fide ad Gratianum, C. 9. They were not condemn'd by human industry, but by the Authority (more than Human) of those Fathers. For as St. Greg. Nazian, saith in his Oration to St. Athanasius; The Fathers of this Council were gather'd by the holy Ghost. He had the same Spirit that the other St. Gregory the Great had, who said, I do profess my self to reverence the first Four Councils as I reverence the four Books of the Gospel: And in the same manner I reverence the Fifth Council. Whosoever is of another mind let him be an Anathema. Li. Epist. Ep. 24. Prope finem. And the very self same he saith again, Lib. 2. Indict. 11. Ep. 10. ad Sabinum. And Justin the Emperor before him, made this saying famous by inserting it into the Law, Authentiarum Collat. 9. de Eccl.

de Eccl. tit. c. 1. We receive the Doctrine of the said (four first) Councils as we receive the holy Scriptures. Unless perhaps, John the Second (Bishop of Rome) who liv'd and died in the days of this Emperor (An. 532.) Epist. ad Liberium Severinum, &c. gave occasion to this Saying by these following words spoken of the first Four Councils, *This is the ground of our Faith; this is the most firm Rock of our Belief.* Behold how he relies on the Councils, as St. Paul seems to teach, when he calls the Church *the Pillar and Ground of the Truth.* From this the Councils are call'd by Antiquity, *Rules of Faith*, as you have heard already out of St. Cyril, and St. Leo. So Vincentius Lirinensis adversus Hæreses, speaking of the Council of Ephesus, says, Where question was made *de Sanciendis fidei Regulis*, of establishing the Rules of Faith. So Cassiodor. Institut. Divin. L. 1. C. 11. And that no mistake in the Rules of Faith may hurt you, read over the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Yet more fully spoke Pope Gelasius An. 490. Epist. 11. ad Episcopos Dardania, where giving a Reason why, after the Definition of a General Council in any Point of Faith, that Point ought never again to be question'd, no not so much as in another Council; For, says he, *otherwise no Constitution of the Church should be stable, if Men cease not to rise up*

against the Foundation of Truth, Contra fundamentum veritatis se attollere: Calling thus the Definitions of Councils the very Foundations of Truth.

5. When thou shalt have read but this small part of Authorities for the Infallibility of the Church Representative, or assembled in a General Council, thou wilt stand astonished to read in some of our Adversaries, that there is no mention at all in Antiquity of the Infallibility of the Church: For thou seest here, First, how Councils are call'd purposely to end all Controversies in Faith, by defining what is to be believ'd by all; that is, what is to be undoubtedly held as Divine Truth, reveal'd by God. All the Fathers, who assembled to define this, did assume an unquestionable Authority to their Assembly to do this: Upon this Authority they pass'd their Votes, in order to make a Definition of what was to be propos'd to all Men living then, and ever to live in the Church hereafter; even Cursing and Excommunicating all, who should at any time believe contrary to what they defin'd; which had been a most Sacrilegious, and impious, and a most unjust and tyrannical Act, and the most destructive to the Church that could be invented, if, by so great an Authority, a Precedent were given, and a wide gap opened to press Errors,

Errors, upon all the World present and to come, to be believ'd as Divine Verities reveal'd by God. The most bloody Persecution of Tyrants could never have been half so pernicious to the Church, as would have been to be compell'd by General Councils (that is, by the unanimous consent of Christendom) to embrace that as a Divine Verity, which is, in real Truth, a Lie father'd upon God. Surely a practice so universal, so frequent, so pernicious, so notoriously public, would have been cry'd out upon over and over again by the most Zealous, and most Learn'd Ancient Fathers; who notwithstanding never opened their Mouths against this proceeding of Councils: For those proceedings could not be justifiable, tho' those Councils had defin'd nothing but Truth at the present; but so, that they had been liable to define Falsity; because thus they did settle for ever a Court, which by way of course should perpetually be call'd and assembled, for the Definition of matters of greatest moment, which Definitions, under pain of Excommunication were to be submitted unto by all the World: Now if these Definitions could be Errors, this was nothing else but to take the surest course they could invent, to circumvent all Ages into incurable Errors. And yet

this was the proceeding of the purest Antiquity; and this course they held the best to preserve Purity of Faith. And, as you have seen, the most Holy Fathers revered with highest respect all the General Councils, which had pass'd before, or in their days, leaving us Example to shew the like respect to all which have pass'd, or may pass in our days. For the Authority given by God is equally given to other as lawful Councils; to wit, the infallible Authority of judging right by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, so often insisted upon by the Fathers now cited. Whence it is, that if you read Histories of all Ages, you shall never meet with any Man (held for Catholic) who ever opened his Mouth, I do not say, to cry down, but even in the least degree to call in question the truth of any thing which he knew to be defin'd by a lawful General Council. *What boldness then is it, after the Authority of so great a Council, that they make new Disputations and Questions?* saith St. Athanasius, *Epist. ad Epist.* And yet this boldness your Doctors allow, when they permit any one to review Councils, to see whether they be conformable to Gods Word, as I shewed, *Seet. 1. N. 4.* But, as it is said in the Epistle of *Julius ad Diaconum Flaccillum*, &c. registred in St. Athanasius's Apologia 2. E-

very

very Synod has an unviolable Authority, and that Judge is contumeliously dealt withal, whose Judgment by others is again examined. There is extant in the Council of Chalcedon, Act. 3. that excellent Edict, in which are these words expressly declaring, that Councils are to end Controversies; Let all prophane Contention cease, for he is truly Impious and Sacrilegious, who, after the Judgment pass'd by so many Priests, reserves any thing to be handled further by his own private Judgment. And yet you will presume to reserve the final review, and the approving or reprovng all the Definitions of the Council, by your private Judgment of Discretion, if that lead you to conceive you have that clear Scripture on your side. He was the chief Bishop of the Church, and presided by his Legates in the Council of Chalcedon, who writ these following words to the Emperor; (*Leo Magnus Ep. 78. ad Leonem Augustum, C. 3.*) Concerning the Affairs which have been defin'd at Nice, and at Chalcedon, we dare not undertake a new treaty, questioning again those things as if they were either doubtful or of weak strength; which so great an Authority by the holy Ghost has settled. What he dar'd not do, any Cobler amongst you dares venture on. But very truly said *Gelasius* (whom I cited in the end of the last number) the doing of this is the undo-

ing of all Councils ; for *no Constitution of the Church should be stable, if Men cease not to rise up against the Foundation of Truth* ; for so he called the Definition of a General Council almost Twelve hundred years ago. You, who make these Definitions fallible, make them no Definitions ; for they never put a final end to the Controversie, they never do terminate any Point ; for after their Determinations, as if they were no Determinations, you call all to your private Review ; and there, what you really think fit, your Judgment of Discretion (without any Judgment and Discretion) freely rejecteth and disbelieves.

6. I say not this rashly, for, as *St. Bernard* saith in a Sermon upon the Resurrection ; *What greater Pride can there be, than that one Man should prefer his Judgment before a whole Congregation ?* It is fine Doctrin, that you and I should sit down, and call to our Examen the Definitions and Determinations of a General Council. Have we such assistance of the Holy Ghost as Councils have ? Have we half the Authority, or any thing like to the one quarter of the Wit, or Learning, or Knowledge, or Judiciousness which they have ? Let, I pray, us two rather sit down, and examin how true this is which I shall now say ; Either the
Determinations

Determinations of Councils in Points of Faith (for of these I always speak) be such as are evidently against clear Scripture; or else the Texts, to which we think the Council to be contrary, be not clear and evident to the contrary; which if they be not, it would be a shameless imprudence in you and me, to think we should surer hit right upon the meaning of obscure Texts in Scripture, than a whole General Council (the greatest Authority in Christendom) has done. But now if the places alleagable against the Councils be evidently clear, do you think to perswade any prudent and pious Man, that this evident clearness could not be seen by so very many, and those so very eminent for Piety, and for Prudence, as are known to have subscrib'd to so many General Councils; who could use, and are to be judg'd to have us'd all the best Rules to understand Scripture as well as we two? God give us Humility, God give us Charity, God have mercy on us in the bitter Day of his Judgment, if we pass so bitter a Judgment against the whole Church Representative: And yet if you pass not this Judgment; you will never pass this Objection without being pos'd.

Sect. 19.

This Court in deciding Controversies rules her self by the Word of God written and unwritten; and why she rules her self by Tradition.

I. **I**T was a very gross proceeding in *Calvin, L. 4. Inst. C. 1. Sect. 7. & C. 3. Sect. 2.* So to propose our Doctrine, as if we taught, that our Church might define and determin what she thinks fit, without any relation to the Word of God. No less grossly did your *Zanchius Tom. 8. Tract. de Scrip. 2. 3.* go about to perswade his Reader, that we hold the Authority of the *Roman Church* greater than that of *Christ*, and the Gospel; whereas we all hold, that every General Council is to examin Controversies belonging to Faith, according to the Word of God. But, because all Human Learning, Wit, and Judgment would still be liable to Error, we say, That *Christ*, of his goodness, has obtain'd for his Church (thus lawfully assembled,) such an Assistance of the Holy Ghost, as shall ever preserve it from Error. True it is, that in Wit, and Judgment, and Learning, so great an Assembly far excels your private Ministers: But this assistance of the

the Holy Ghost is an advantage surpassing all that is Human: This Assistance we have prov'd in the last Question, and in the last Section we shewed this Assistance given to General Councils.

2. Now to see what the Councils on their part are to do; I must tell you, that their chief business is to examin the Points in Controversie; hearing all that occurs for the one side and the other, and permitting several Replies, if any remain, in due time to be made. After this diligence is us'd, they consider what seems most conformable to the Word of God, and every ones Vote is to pass upon this particular. But here I must tell you, that by the Word of God, all Councils, and Orthodox Believers have ever understood, not only Gods written Word contain'd in Scripture, but also his unwritten Word made known to the Church by only Tradition; which Tradition also is, and was ever accounted by the Church the very best and surest Interpreter of the Scripture. The Votes therefore of the Fathers assembled in Council are demanded, not only of what they think to be conformable to Gods Word written in Scripture, but also how conformable such a Point is, or is not, to that Tradition which they have all receiv'd

396 *The Roman Church is*

ceiv'd from the Fathers of their Church, as deliver'd to them from their Fathers for Gods Word, by Tradition committed to their Forefathers as such, from the Apostles themselves. So for Example, if in a Council there do's arise a Question, Whether we are to pray for the Dead, or to adore the Sacrament, or to confess our Sins to a Priest; the Council asks the Prelates of *Italy, Britain, Spain, Polonia, Greece, &c.* What in each one of their respective Nations, so vastly different from one another, has been the ancient Practice and Belief amongst them? And whether at any time such a Point was ever said to have been introduc'd among them as a novelty? Or contrarywise, that no other beginning of that practice could be ever heard of than the first beginning of Christian Religion? Now when by the unanimous answer of all the Prelates of *Italy, Spain, Britain, Polonia, Greece, &c.* It is constantly averred that in all these so vastly distant Nations, Prayer for the Dead, Adoration of the Sacrament, Auricular Confession, were ever, time out of mind, practis'd and believ'd, and no time in any one of those Nations can be found, in which this Practice and Belief was held to be introduc'd as a Novelty; but contrarywise they are, and
ever

ever were (as far as they can hear of) esteemed to have been deliver'd to them, together with all the other Points of Christian Faith, when this Faith was first planted in each one of those Nations. It cannot but then appear evidently credible unto the Council, that these Doctrins and Practices are Apostolical, whence accordingly they pass their Votes to Define them. So that when their Votes are past and gather'd, *This only, and nothing but this, the Catholic Church do's do by the Decrees of her Council; that what before they had received by only Tradition from their Ancestors, that now they leave consigned in Authentical writing to all Posterity.* These are the very words of *Vincentius. Lirinensis, Advers. Hæreses*, neither could I devise any fitter for our Doctrin.

3- If you ask, why the Church or Councils esteem Tradition so much? I Answer *First*; Because in Prudence, and Piety, they cannot but esteem as much Gods unwritten Word, as his written; seeing that the word of a true honest Man, is as much to be esteemed true, when it is only to be deliver'd by word of Mouth, as when it is deliver'd by writing. Your Ministers usually so confound the business, that they make their Auditors even to startle, when they tell them, that we hold Tradition equal to Scripture;

Scripture ; because first, they have deeply imprinted in their minds, that Tradition is nothing but an old Tale set on foot by I know not whom : But if they meant to deal really, they should say what the Truth is ; That we do indeed equalize Tradition to Scripture, and that we have all reason to do so. Why, What is Scripture ? Gods Word written. What is Tradition ? The same Gods Word notified, not by writing, but by the full report of the Catholic Church. I pray now how do we wrong God, when we say of his Word, what we say of the word of one, whom we most commend for Truth, that his Word only spoken, and not written, is as sure, or true (and consequently as much to be esteemed, and credited) as any Word of his that is written even with his own hand ? Nay, I pray mark how you wrong God, who slight Tradition, which is nothing but the Word of God unwritten. What wrong is it to an honest Man, to slight all he says unless he confirms it by writing ? I know the best Answer you have to justify your selves is ; That Scripture is assuredly known to us to be Gods own Word : But as for our Traditions, you do not know, nor cannot believe that God do's own them for his own word. But give me leave to ask, Whence are you assured that

that the Scripture is Gods own Word :
Your best, and indeed your only, assurance is, that all the Christian World saith so ; See *Sect. 20. N. 5.* That then which makes you , with so great assurance, know Gods written Word, is Tradition : But the same Tradition, which tells us that the Apostles deliver'd these Points to us as Divine Verities, in writing ; tells us also, that the same Apostles deliver'd these and these Points to us as Divine Verities by word of Mouth only. If the Tradition of the Church be a Liar in this last part, she may as well be a Liar in the first part. When you believe Scripture, you trust to Tradition, testifying that the Apostles gave such and such Books to the Church of the first Age to be believed as Gods Word ; See two admirable places of *St. Austin* pressing this hard which I will cite presently, *N. 7.* Again, when you believe that the Copies, which we have now of those Books, be neither forged, nor corrupted Copies, but do truly agree with the Originals given out by the Apostles ; you again trust to the Traditions of all the after Churches that have been in every Age from the Apostles to this very present Church. For it was as much in the power of the Church in any one of these Ages, to have thrust a false Copy into your hand, in place of a
true

true one, as to thrust a false Tradition into the Mouth of every Catholic every where, in place of a true one. Admirably *Tertullian*. (de Præscript. c. 28.) *How is it likely that so many and so great Churches should Err in one Faith? Among many events there is not every where one issue. The Errors of the Churches* (had there been any in the delivering of these Traditions) *must needs have varied*, (for tho' every Man should agree to tell his Child a Lie, yet every one would not agree in telling just the very self same Lies:) *But that which amongst many is found one, is not mistaken, but* (as a sure Tradition) *deliver'd: Audeat ergo aliquis dicere eos errasse qui tradiderunt? Dare then any Man say that they all Erred who deliver'd* (with such uniformity) *this Tradition?* So he, holding it, as you see, impudence to say this Tradition could be fallible. Is not this clearly to hold the Tradition of so many and so great Churches infallible? Behold here then plain Popery in the highest Point proved and approved within Two hundred years after *Christ*. But more of *Tertullians* Opinion concerning Tradition hereafter, *Seet. 20. N. 4.* and much has been said, *Seet. 12. N. 4, 5.*

4. My task now is, to shew Tradition do's convey and bring down Gods Word to us as sure, yea rather surer, by perpetual Practice,

Practice, and uniform Doctrin, than by any writing. To shew this, I brought many strong Arguments, *Seet. 10. N. 13.* and *Seet. 16. N. 1, 2.* In both which Sections I have said many things of Traditions; and in the first place I resolved the chief Objections against them. But yet I will clear this, and one or two other doubts which trouble many. For clearing then of this Doubt, let us take two Traditions, one confessed by you to be a true one, the other to be proved by me to be no less true than the former, because it is testified by as good a Tradition as the former; and therefore either the former is not proved sufficiently by this Testimony, or else the latter is. Yet the truth is (and my Argument shall make it good) that both of them are made as credible to be Gods Word by Tradition only, as any writing by its sole force could make them. The first Tradition which I will, for example sake, take, is *the Baptizing of Children* (of which I spoke, *Seet. 8. N. 3.*) The Second, is *of Praying for the Dead.* Of these two I discourse to my purpose thus: Both these Points (say I) were for Divine Verities and Practices recommended by the Apostles to the primitive Church, and so from hand to hand came most undoubtedly deliver'd down to us. Hence, conformable to this Tradition, every

every where the Christians Baptized their little Children, every where they Prayed for the Faithful departed. Nothing more common to all Men than to be Born, nothing more common than to Die, for ever one who is Born; hence, as the daily custom is of being Born, so the daily custom in all the Churches, is to Baptize those who are newly Born; and as it is the daily custom for all that are Born to Die; so the daily custom was to Pray for the Dead. But yet Prayer for the Dead was, by more frequent Practice, testified in this respect, because those who are Born, are Baptized but once in their Lives; but those who are Dead are many times, and that for many years after their Death, Prayed for by Name, besides the daily Prayers for all the Faithful departed in general. Well now, let us suppose that both these Traditions be called in question, whether they be Faithful deliverers of the true Word of God; or rather, in place of it, deliver some human invention; as you will say, *Praying for the Dead is*, and the Anabaptists will say, *that Baptizing of Children is*. Let us now further see, which of these two Traditions cannot defend it self from Forgery, as well as any Scripture question'd of being true Scripture: For example, the Apocalyps, or Revelation, with your

Lutheran

Lutheran Brethren hold not to be true Scripture. How will you defend the Apocalyps? You can say no more than I have said, *Sect. 3. N. 12.* For all our Canon in general, and the Tradition upon which those Councils received the Apocalyps had more contradiction, than ever Prayer for the Dead had. For the Apocalyps was not only rejected by the most Ancient Heretics, the Marcionists, the Alogians, the Theodocians; but also by divers Ancient Catholics (especially the Grecians, as *St. Jerome* testifies *Epist. ad Dardanum.*) But Prayer for the Dead was contradicted by no Catholic at all; amongst Ancient Heretics, *Aërius* indeed did contradict it; but this is noted in him as a peculiar Heresie of his own invention, both by *St. Austin* (whose words I gave you *Sect. 1. fine.*) and *St. Epiphanius*, *Heresie 75.* saith, this *Aërius* had an *Aërian* wicked Spirit against the Church; and then he denounceth against him, that Prayers do profit the Dead. And the same Saint there says, the Church do's this necessarily (this is his word) by the Tradition received from her Ancestors. And he not long after (*Heresie 77.*) do's profess, that every Man falls into strange inconveniencies, if he will but once pass the bounds set him by the Holy Church, and leap over the Hedges of Traditions. He held therefore Prayer for the Dead

Dead suitable to the Doctrine of the Church, and Tradition. And as for St. Austin (*Chap. 1. de Cura pro Mortuis agenda*) He says, *that the Universal Church did shine with this custom of Praying for the Dead at the Altar.* The greatest Doctors of the Church could not be Ignorant of a custom shining in the Church, not particular, but universal. And it is this shining of this Custom which I press, and not St. Austins Authority, otherwise than as a witness of this shining Tradition. He also *Serm. 32. de Verbis Apostoli* (which place Bede. 1. *Thef. 4.* almost a Thousand years ago cited out of St. Austin) says thus: *By the Prayers of the Holy Church; and by the wholesome Sacrifice, and by the Alms which are given for their Souls, it is not to be doubted but the Dead are helped; so that our Lord deals more mercifully with them, than their Sins have deserved.* Why is not this to be doubted of? It follows, *Because this, deliver'd down from our Fathers, the whole Church do's observe.* See St. Chrys. testimony of this Tradition in the next *Secl. N. 4.* And this Tradition is that which I now stand upon, which indeed did shine in the Practice of the Primitive Church. You shall not find one Liturgy, or Service Book, used in the Ancient Church, which is not witness of this Tradition; tho' these Books were found in every Parish.

Parish of Christendom in which Divine Service was almost daily said. *Tertullian* (who lived within less than a Hundred and fifty years after the Canon of Scripture was finished) do's number up this Custom of Prayer for the Dead among the Ancient Traditions; *De corona milit. c. 3.* It is ordinary in Law (for proof of long possession) to find Witnesses testifying what was done, not only Fifty, but also Three or Four score years ago: Wherefore even two or three handing of this Tradition by such aged hands, would reach down this Practice from St. *John* the Evangelist's time to *Tertullian*. And it is but a small allowance to a thing testified to be a Tradition, to allow it three or Four Descents (can the Authenticalness of the Apocalyps be better proved, going upwards to the Apostles, than this?) I am sure Baptism for Children cannot. Again, in both these Points it is a most strong Argument (and as strong for Prayer for the Dead, as for the other) that no time can be named in which these Customs began: No Man can be thought of, who could by human means (and such means as should not make a mighty Noise amongst those great reverencers of Tradition) draw all the World, in so short a time after the Apostles, to follow Customs as Apostolical which then, that is,

in that Age in which they were first vent-
 ed, were evidently by every Man, not
 only known, but clearly seen to be
 new hatched Novelties; and not Anci-
 ent and Apostolical Tradition. This
 Man who broached this false Doctrin
 should have been put in the Catalogues
 of Heretics by St. *Epiphanius* and St. *Au-*
stin; whereas they did not only not put
 him down for an Heretic, but they both
 did put down *Aërius* for one, because he
 taught the contrary. Now if you speak
 of these Customs, going downward, un-
 til the Age in which they began to be de-
 nied by Anabaptists, or Protestants,
 Prayer for the Dead has come down with
 such a full stream, that it drew all
 Countries in all Ages with it; in so much
 that every where (but among a few late
 born *Arminians* and *Albigenses*) the pub-
 lic Service-Books in all Parishes of all
 Countries can be as sure witnesses of this
 Custom, as the Copies of Age after Age
 can testifie we have the true Copy of the
 Apocalyps. And so old Rituals will
 testifie (tho' not so fully) Baptism of Chil-
 dren, by witnessing the Ceremonies ob-
 serv'd in such Baptisms. And, as for
 Prayer for the Dead, the very Stones cry
 out in all old Monuments, for our Pray-
 ers for those who lie Interr'd under them.
 The oldest Foundations are those, which
 our

our greatest Grandfathers made (as appears by the most Ancient Records) for the obtaining Prayers for their Souls: And this not in one Country, but there is not one Country which abounds not with such Monuments, and such Records, the very strongest proofs of assured Antiquity and unquestionable Tradition.

5. Thus, I hope, I have made good, that, Tradition shinning in perpetual Practice in all Times, and all Ages, is a surer Relater and reporter, than a Testimony in Writing; which, if Ancient, must also have the prime Testimony (witnessing it to be uncorrupt) from Tradition. And hence also you clearly see, that Scripture, true or false, can be no better known to be so than true Tradition from false; for if Tradition could be false in any Point so universally current, it might bear witness to a false Scripture, and deny due approbation to many true ones.

6. When then we are demanded, how we can know a true Tradition from a false one? We Answer, *First*, That we can do this better than you can know true Books, and true Copies of true Books of Scripture, from false; for, before you can do either of these, you must first know true Tradition from false; that hence you may, not conjecturally, but assuredly

assuredly say, *These are the true Books of Scripture, these are the true Copies of these true Books, because true Tradition recommends them for such: These be false Books, or false Copies of true Books, because the Tradition, which recommends these, is false.* Tell me the means by which infallibly the true Tradition in this Point may be known from the false; and that very means I will assign to know, in other Points true Tradition from false. *Secondly*, I shall shew, that we have better means to do this, than all the World had to know their true Traditions from false, for the first Two thousand years, before the time of *Moses*. *Thirdly*, I Answer directly, by assigning this means, which is, when a doubt begins to be far spread in the Church concerning any Tradition, to call a general Council, and there, by the examination instituted by Men most knowing of Antiquity in general, and particularly well versed in the received, and approved old Customs of their Countries. For the Countries of those in the Council being so far distant, and so wholly independent one of another, cannot possibly have all of them received, and that without any known opposition in any one of them, one and the very self same Tradition, from any other hands but from those, from whom they received
their

their whole Faith, and this particular Tradition for part of it. For had the beginners and sowers of this Tradition, now question'd, been after the first Planters of our Faith, there would in some Country or other, be found out some Author of this first Tradition; there would be some Fame good or bad of that Man, who was able to perswade a phansie of his own to be Apostolical Doctrin, and to be firmly held so by all the World, without opposition in any part thereof, even tho' this Tradition (as you say of most of our Traditions) had a direct opposition to the Ancient Doctrin of the Apostles. Which Doctrin, when our Traditions were held for Apostolical, was too too fresh to be so soon forsaken, and that so easily, and so generally, without any opposition. Now when the gravest Prelates from all parts of the World Asssembled, having instituted an exact Process of the true Antiquity and Universality of the Tradition question'd; and in this Process, found an Unanimous Consent of all kind of Testimonies, from all corners of the World: It is now juridically and notoriously made evident, that such a Point has come down to us by a true Tradition; and for that very Reason, is a true object of Faith, being the Word of God, deliver'd by as faithful a Messenger,

T

fenger, as the very Copies of Scripture are. And thus, when it was grown doubtful in the Church, whether such and such Books, were part of the true Canon of Scripture; the Tradition which recommended these Books, was examin'd in the third Council of *Carthage*, in which *S. Austin* was present, and there (as I shewed *Sect. 3. N. 12.*) all the Books of our Canon (so different from yours) were found to be recommended to the Church, by a true and authentical Tradition; and therefore we imbrace them as the Word of God: Tradition being as credible a relator of Gods Word, deliver'd by the Apostles to the Church, as any Writing.

7. Whence again, you need not wonder to see that by us; and by the Fathers, cited in the next Section, *Num. 4.* Tradition is equaliz'd to Scripture, for this is nothing else, but to hold that the Word of God deliver'd by Tradition, is as sure a Messenger as any Writing can be, and is to be believed as much as the Word of God, deliver'd by Writing, and such a Writing as ha's no surer Witness of being Authentical than Tradition. Hence *S. Austin* (*de utilit. Credendi C. 14.*) disputing with an Heretic, who would first have him to believe Scripture before Catholic Tradition, makes the Heretic speak

ſpeak thus, *Believe this Writing.* Then he replies, *But every Writing, if it be new and unheard of, recommended by a few, no other Reason confirming it, we do not believe the Writing; but we believe thoſe who bring forth this Writing; Wherefore if you (Lutherans, Calviniſts, &c.) bring forth this Writing, you being ſo few and ſo unknown (for where were you theſe laſt Thouſand years before Luther)? I have no mind to believe you.* Now becauſe the Heretic knew not how to preſs *S. Auſtin*, to give firſt credit to this Writing or Scripture, by ſaying, that all of his Religion ſaid it was the Word of God, without preſſing him with the Teſtimony of all the Chriſtian World by *Universal Tradition*; *S. Auſtin* prevents him, by telling him, *Well, you will ſend me to the multitude and ſame (of Church Tradition); but I pray, rather admoniſh me to ſeek out the chief leaders of this Multitude, and to ſeek them out moſt diligently and moſt laboriouſly, that from theſe (Governoures of the Churches) rather than from you: I may learn ſomething of theſe Writings; for if theſe Men had not been, I ſhould never have known that there had been at all any thing to be learn'd (concerning theſe Scriptures.)* Truly, in my mind this, not only Authority, but this moſt preſſing Reason of *S. Auſtin* convinceth, that the Governours of this Multitude of all true Believers,

T 2

(eſpecially

412 *The Roman Church is*

(especially Assembled in one Council together) are the best Guides God has given us upon Earth, both to know which is Scripture, or the true Word of God written; and which Tradition, or the true Word of God un-written; and also to know most assuredly, how this Word of God is rightly understood. Wherefore, presently the same *S. Austin* (*Cap. 15.*) do's admonish us for the avoiding of all Errors, *as the easiest means thereunto, willingly to obey the precepts of that Catholic Church, Precepts made by her with so great an Authority.* And then in his Sixteenth Chapter, he clearly tells us, That God having given us this Authority, we ought not to despair of an infallible means to know the truth; because this Authority is that very infallible means confirmed by Miracles, and by the miraculous multitude, following it so extreamly against all human interest. Thus then he Discourseth, *For if the Divine Providence of God do's not preside in Human Affairs, in vain would solicitude be about Religion: But if both the very outward beauty of all things, and our inward Conscience do's both publickly and privately exhort us to seek out and serve God, we are not to despair, that there is some Authority appointed by the same God, on which Authority we relying, as on an assured step, may be lifted up to God.* This Authority moves us by

two ways, partly by Miracles, partly by the multitude of its Followers. Behold here an Authority appointed by God; an Authority, on which we may most securely rely, and not only not get a fall (slipping into Errors) by leaning upon it confidently; but an Authority, on which we relying, as on an assured step, may be lifted up to God, who with Miracles has confirm'd this Authority to be most secure. Whence presently, S. Austin tells us how those Miracles have drawn so great a multitude. But whether this multitude were Catholics or Protestants, you shall know them by their Fruits, for they had a Temperance extended to Fasting with Bread and Water; and not only daily Fasts, but Fasts continued for many days. A Chastity disdaining the having Wife or Children; a Patience slighting Crosses and Flames; a Liberality reaching forth to the distributing out to the Poor their whole Patrimonies. These things we see still daily among Catholics; and tho' (as S. Austin adds) but few do these things, yet all people praise them, approve them, love them, none accounted them superstitious in those days. When we see then so great hope from God, so great profit and fruit, shall we doubt to betake our selves to the lap of that Church, which even by the Confession of Mankind from the Apostolic Seat (so Antiquity useth to call the Seat of the Bishop of Rome) by Suc-

cession of Bishops, has obtain'd the top of Authority; Heretics in vain barking round about it, but condemn'd partly by the Judgment of the People (upon Tradition) partly by the Gravity of Councils, partly by the Majesty of Miracles; to which Church, not to give the first place, is truly a thing either of greatest Impisty, or of headlong Arrogancy. So he. So I. So we all.

8. I have put down the place more fully, because Dr. *Fern Sect. 30.* would disprove our Tenets by the deep Silence of them in Antiquity, and particularly in *S. Austin*, whom I shall shew also presently (*Sect. 21. N. 5. 6.*) in a dozen places of his Works, to hold distinctly this Infallibility of the Church in her Traditions and Doctrin. Well then, she being as infallible in delivering the unwritten Word of God, as in delivering the written Word; the Prelates Assembled in her Councils, have as much reason to rule themselves, and their Subjects, by the one as by the other. By a Writing only, we never knew any Common Wealth govern'd. By Tradition only, the whole *English Nation* has kept our Common Law, which was never written by the Law-makers themselves: Yet is made no less known by only Tradition, than our Statute Laws, which were deliver'd in writing by the Law-makers. But what speak

bo-
it,
the
ra-
li-
first
m-
I.
ul-
if-
of
in
at-
ces
n-
i-
g
en
t-
er
le
e
e
o-
le
n
e
e
n
n
t
k

speak I of one Nation? The whole
 Church through the whole World was
 govern'd by Tradition only, for the
 first Two thousand years; and then part-
 ly by Tradition, partly by Writing, it
 was govern'd for above Two thousand
 years more; to-wit, for the second Two
 thousand years from *Moses* until *Christs*
 time. See *Seet. 16. N. 1.* Now from the
 preaching of *Christ* unto the finishing of
 the Canon, and the divulging of the same
 in such Languages as all Nations under-
 stood, very many years pass'd, and all
 the true Believers in *Christs* Church were
 govern'd by Tradition only: See *Seet. 16.*
N. 2. And whereas some of our Adver-
 saries obscurely answer, *That the Word of*
God was in substance before Christs Church,
 which (say they) was begotten by it. We
 reply clearly to them thus: When (say
 we) you speak of the Word of God,
 which was before Scripture, and which
 begot the Church, you speak of the un-
 written Word of God: This unwritten
 Word is that very thing which we call
 Tradition. And indeed, when you speak
 of such a Word, as must be sufficient
 for an exterior and infallible direction
 for so many Millions (as were to be di-
 rected by it in the way of Salvation be-
 fore the Scripture was all written and
 divulged in such Languages that might

make it fit to direct all Nations) you must of necessity put this Word of God outwardly express'd by some means or other, expressing it in such a manner, as might be able to produce this effect of guiding whole Millions in the way of Salvation, by an infallible Belief of all that God had said by that Word. Now (I pray) find me out any Word of God, any where existent before Scripture, in a manner fit for the end I now speak of, except this Word be granted to have wholly existed in the Oral Tradition of the Church of those times. You all say, Gods Word reveal'd, is the Ground of all Faith. All these Millions of the true Believers in those Ages had true Faith; therefore they had Gods Word reveal'd, and reveal'd in a sufficient manner to ground Divine Faith. But they had Gods Word reveal'd by Oral Tradition only; therefore Gods Word, reveal'd by Oral Tradition only, is a sufficient ground to ground Divine Faith; which it could not be, were it not infallible, in what it delivers for Gods Word; and what is thus deliver'd (by being so deliver'd) is a fit object of Divine Faith, such as they all had in those Ages.

9. This then is the first Reason why the Church in her Councils directs her self as well by the unwritten, as by the written

written Word of God, because the one is as truly in it self the Word of God, and as sufficiently notified to us to be so by Tradition, as the Scripture is notified to be so by Writing; for which cause, Holy Fathers still taught those things which we know by Tradition only, to be believ'd and held equally to those things which we know by Scripture. See *Sect. 20. N. 4.* A Second Reason why this Church not only do's, but of necessity must direct and govern her self not by Scripture only, but also by unwritten Traditions, is, because Scripture only do's not deliver down unto us all Points necessary for the whole Church, and all the Members thereof; as I have at large shew'd, *Quest. 2.* naming no fewer than four and twenty of those necessary Points. All these Points being wholly necessary, and Errors being no where more dangerous than in Points wholly necessary, there do's arise an unavoidable necessity to grant, that the first Church planted by the Apostles, receiv'd her necessary direction and infallible instruction in these Points by Tradition only; for manifest it is, that they at the first receiv'd from the Apostles, all compleat instruction in necessary Points: And again, it is no less manifest, that they receiv'd no such compleat instruction in Scripture.

concerning those Twenty four Points, for then we should be able to find this instruction in Scriptures, which we not being able to do, we must perforce grant, that they receiv'd this instruction by Tradition express'd in no kind of Scripture, but such as commanded in general all Men to *hold the Traditions deliver'd to them*, 2 Thes. 2. And that *the' an Angel from Heaven should teach the contrary, or besides what they receiv'd, they should account him Anathema*, Gal. 8. And again, *Have thou the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me*, 2 Tim. 1. 13. And yet again, c. 2. *The things which thou hast heard (he saith not read) of me by many Witnesses, these commend to faithful Men which shall be fit to teach others also*. Now as the first Age receiv'd their necessary instruction by being sent to no other Rule of Faith in these necessary Points than the Tradition of the Church, and by this only were most compleatly instructed in Divine Faith; so now this present Church in all Points not clearly express'd in Scripture, and also in that prime Point of rightly interpreting the Scripture it self, has recourse to Tradition as to an infallible Rule, able to make all that it teacheth a fit Object of Divine and infallible Faith.

10. A Third Reason why Councils
may

may and ought to propose Tradition to themselves for an infallible Rule of Faith; is this, Because that Rule must needs be infallible by which only we can be assur'd what the Apostles both by writing, and out of writing did teach to the Church: For in their Doctrin written and unwritten, all things belonging to Faith are contain'd; That therefore which infallibly teacheth us this, and is also the only thing which teacheth us this, must needs be the infallible Rule of Faith: But Tradition is the only thing which teacheth us this; to-wit, what the Apostles did teach us both by writing and by word of Mouth without writing; which this Tradition performs by Millions of true Believers of the first Age, all taken apart (as Witnesses use to be to find out how well they all agree in their Testimony) and plac'd in several parts in the World, many vastly distant from one another, and yet all delivering the same things to those other Millions, who in greater number succeeded them in life, and in delivering the same things, in the same manner to new Millions of their posterity, all constantly agreeing in the testification of the very self same Points, all affirming them to have been deliver'd publicly in Churches, and greatest Assemblies every where all their Country over;
and

and that so very exceeding often, and by so very many, and by so very divers persons of all kinds of conditions, that it is more possible for all Men in the World to fall into a fit of dancing just for a quarter of an hour at one and the self same time, without ever agreeing to do so before-hand; than it is possible for all these Millions of Men in so different places, and of so different Judgments by nature, and so contrary in their Humors, Inclinations, and proceedings, to conspire thus in one and the same story containing so many particulars, without that thing had been really and notoriously true, which so many Millions, taken in so different circumstances, all testified unanimously to be true. If this do's not make it evidently credible that the Apostles taught this, I dare say, that no Miracle which God can do, without forcing our Wills, can make this Point evidently credible unto us. Neither have we any thing else but this Tradition which makes it evidently credible to us what the Apostles did teach the first Church by Writing, and by such Writings, and by such and such things deliver'd only by word of Mouth. Wherefore either by such a Testimony as this, or by no Testimony at all, we may be induc'd to believe infallibly, that the Apostles did teach such and such things

things by word of Mouth, and also did write such and such Books. And it is most preposterous to believe for this Testimony this last part, and not to believe the first part; yea, this is plain contradiction in him who understands what he do's: For on the one side he saith, The Testimony of Tradition sufficeth to make a thing a fit Object of Divine Faith, so that upon this Testimony only I may build that infallible Assent, by which I believe these and these Books to have been deliver'd by the Apostles; and yet I will not believe, that the Apostles deliver'd by word of Mouth the Doctrin of Praying for the Dead, of Baptising Infants, &c. because this self same Testimony of Tradition sufficeth not to make a thing a fit Object of Faith, to which before I said it did suffice. How then come I now to say it do's not suffice, and to contradict my self with the same breath? I end with Doctor Ferns own words, *Sect. 2.* *It is impossible that all the Christian Churches which began in and about the Apostolical times, and so succeeded through all Nations and Ages, should be either deceiv'd in what they unanimously witnessed, or agree all of them to deceive those who followed them.*

Sect. 20.

That the Fathers teach these Traditions, and the Definitions of the Councils or Church to be infallible.

1. **W**E must first correct the Error of some apprehensions, who do not conceive such Authorities of Fathers to speak home to our purpose, unless they say plainly, *the Church is infallible*. The Fathers did conceive themselves in their Writings to speak to Men capable so far of Reason, as to be able to deduce a clear evident consequence, when they are compleatly furnish'd with the Principles. From which it must needs follow, You shall not perhaps find a clear place that saith *the Apostles were infallible*; yet we have evident Principles from whence we deduce that Verity. Note that we now vulgarly use this word *infallible*, because no word more fully, and briefly expresseth our mind. The thing meant by this word, was by most equivalent expressions, set down to the very full by Antiquity.

2. I will shew this clearly by what I have already shew'd Antiquity to affirm concerning the Infallibility of Councils, in the last Section but one. There you shall
see

see *Constantine* prais'd by Antiquity for reverencing the Sentence of the first Council as if it had been spoken by Gods own Mouth, and punishing the gainfayers of it as Violators of a Divine Law. Is not this a full acknowledgment of Infallibility? As also when *St. Athanasius* calls this Definition, the Word of God. Is not the like fully acknowledgment which was shew'd there, to be made by *St. Hormisdas*, believing the Holy Ghost to have spoken in the Fathers of that Council, and by *St. Cyril*, affirming them to have been inspir'd by the Holy Ghost that they should not swarve from truth having the Holy Ghost speaking in them; and calling their Definitions, *The Rule of pure Faith*, which nothing can be but what is infallible. The same is spoken equivalently when he says again, *That Christ did preside invisibly in that Council* in which the Embassadors of the Bishop of Rome presided visibly. The same is done by *St. Leo*, affirming, *That to be settled by the Holy Ghost which was defin'd by the Council*, and calling the Canons thereof, *made by the Holy Ghost or Spirit of God*, using also the like speeches of the Definitions of the Council of *Chalcedon*, terming them a *Rule proceeding from Divine Inspiration*; Is not this to acknowledge such a Rule infallible? What more has been written of the Apostles Doctrin? Divers other

other such like sayings I have there given you, out of the Holy Fathers, affirming Lawful Councils *to be gather'd by the Holy Ghost, and what was done in them not to be done by Human industry, because the Fathers so assembled were full of the Holy Ghost.* Hence also there was such reverence professed to their Definitions *as to the very Gospels themselves,* which is to express Infallibility in a superlative Degree: In which Degree also I may place the sayings of those Fathers, who called *the Definitions of Councils, The Ground of our Faith, the Rock of our Belief, Rules of Faith, the very Foundations of Truth.* All superlative expressions of Infallibility, and yet Men will please to wonder at the deep silence of Fathers concerning this Point, in which they could never content themselves to speak in a vulgar manner, but always in such a high strain of veneration, that the true Believers might be not only instructed to believe, but also taught to reverence this Infallibility, as the Communication of the Spirit of Divine Truth, as indeed it is: Concerning Councils then what we said in that Section containing all this here recapitulated shall suffice. Remember also what *Vincentius Lirinensis, c. 4.* saith, *All those who will not be accounted Heretics must conform themselves to the Decrees of General Councils.* Let us now
see

see what they say of the Infallibility of Tradition, taking Tradition as it contains what is not written in Scripture, and yet is necessary to be believed or practised.

3. This Tradition the Fathers acknowledge infallible and several ways; some of them I have sufficiently insinuated, *Sect.* 12. where I shewed that the Fathers refus'd to stand to Scripture only, as to the only Rule of Faith, because all necessary Principles for convincing of Heretics could not be deduced sufficiently from thence : And consequently they did hold that there was some other Rule of Faith, containing those Principles, to-wit Tradition, which could not be this other Rule of Faith, nor furnish them sufficiently with such Principles, except she, in delivering of them, were infallible. There also I shewed that the Fathers held divers Points necessarily to be believed or practised, for which they professed themselves to have no Scripture, but only Tradition: Therefore they held this to be a sufficient ground of Faith. There also I shewed that they held divers Points to be damnable Errors, which they know to be contrary to no written Rule, therefore they thought it was sufficient to hold them for damnable Heresies, only because they were
con-

contrary to the unwritten Rule of Faith, which we call Tradition, which if it were a fallible Rule, it might be gainsaid without falling into the damnable sin of Heresie, of which sin the gainfayers of it are, for this only reason accus'd by the Fathers. I have also *Seet. 16. N. 3.* shew'd, how manifestly *St. Ireneus* teacheth the unwritten Rule of Tradition (and such Tradition as was really in the Church then existent,) to be a sufficient Rule, and ground for Divine Faith, and consequently to be infallible. In the very last *Seet. N. 3.* I gave you *Tertullians* plain words, condemning them who say, *the Church can Err in her Traditions.* But of *Tertullian*, See *Seet. 12. N. 4, 5.* In the next number following I gave you two clear places out of *St. Epiphanius* for our Obligation to follow these Traditions. Going on to the Seventh Numb. I gave you not only a convincing Authority, but an unanswerable Argument of *St. Austins* for the Infallibility of the Church in her Traditions, whose Authority he teacheth to be appointed by God that there may be some sufficient Authority upon which, Men relying, as upon a well assured step, may be lifted up to God; and he holds it a headlong arrogancy not to rely upon it; which had been most considerately spoken, had it been only fallible.

All

All this is already dispatched, let us now proceed to the full confusion of these who complain of so deep silence in this Point of Infallibility: And because Dr. *Fern*, Sect. 24. saith, the Authorities cited by *Bellarmin* come not home, I will begin with some Authorities taken out of him, which I shall shew to reach abundantly home to our purpose.

4. St. *Denis* Disciple to St. *Paul*, c. 1. *Eccl. Hierarch.* saith, *These our first Captains of Priestly Function* (to-wit the Apostles) *did deliver to us the chiefest and super substantial Points, partly in written, partly in unwritten institutions.* So that, part of the chiefest, and consequently part of the necessary and fundamental Points, were delivered to us in unwritten Traditions only. If therefore this Tradition be only a fallible Rule, we have no infallible Rule to rely upon in all Points necessary, because *part of them* must rely upon unwritten Traditions only. St. *Justin* in the end of his second Apology for the Christians, among these unwritten Traditions placeth some things made necessary by Apostolical Precepts; *As the consecrating of Wine mingled with Water, and that it is lawful to no Body* (tho' never so contrite for his Sins) *to receive the Eucharist before Baptism.* Is not this necessary? And yet what Scripture have you for it, and where find

find you in clear Scripture that the Apostles were Baptiz'd before they Communicated in the last Supper of our Lord? There follows the Authority of *St. Irenaeus*, which I have shewed to reach so home, that the whole Faith of whole Nations may be Divine and infallible, by relying only upon Traditions, even long after the finishing the Canon of Scripture, *St. Chr. upon 2 Tb. 2. It is manifest that the Apostles did not deliver us all things in writing, but many things without any writing; and these be worthy of the very self same Faith.* Good Mr. Doctor, is that which is fallible, *Worthy of the same Faith* which that which is infallible is *Worthy of*? He held then Tradition as infallible as Scripture; of which I have given you a clear Reason, *Sect. 9. Num. 3. Theophilact and Oecumenius*, upon the same place of *St. Paul* deliver just the same Doctrin. Of *St. Epiphanius* I have spoken already. And *Belarmin* recounts how angry *Brentius* is with him for saying, *that it is by Apostolical Tradition known to be unlawful to Marry after a Vow of Virginity.* It is necessary to avoid that which is damnable; wherefore to all who have made such Vows, the knowledge of this Point is necessary. Tradition therefore delivers some necessary Points. Hear *St. Epiphanius's* words (*Hereſie 61.*) *It behoves us also to*
use

use Tradition, because all things cannot be had out of Scripture. The Apostles deliver'd some things in Writings, some things by Tradition; As St. Paul says, according as I have deliver'd unto you. And in another place: So I teach, so I have deliver'd to the Churches. The Holy Apostles of God then have deliver'd that it is a sin to Marry after Virginity decreed, to-wit, by Vow. Besides what I have cited out of Tertullian already, he is much to be insisted upon in his Book *de Præscrip.* where C. 19. he very distinctly Notes, that first of all, before ever you enter into dispute with Heretics out of the Scripture, you must dispute these following Points; From whom, by whom, when and to whom that Discipline was deliver'd by which we were made Christians? And there assuredly will be found the truth of Scriptures the truth of their Interpretation, and the truth of all Christian Traditions. Mark here how the first ground upon which we are to stand, as upon a ground most advantageous for gaining the victory against Error, and purchasing Triumph to Truth, is Tradition; For by that alone, and no possible way but by that, we assuredly know from whom (to-wit from Christ sending his Apostles) by whom (to-wit by the Apostles) When (in the time of their Preaching) to whom (to-wit to the Churches founded by them) this discipline by which we were made

made Christians was deliver'd. From the Tradition then of these Churches as you take the letter of Scripture, we take also the Soul and interpretation of it conserved in the daily answerable practice first instituted by those Apostles, and thence by Tradition (as surely as by any writing) deliver'd down by successive practice of all such Churches; to which Churches *Tertullian*, in his next words, distinctly expresseth himself to send us, for the aforesaid end. And thus (all things being driven to their first Source and Original) will be discover'd, that only Tradition is in which all these Mysteries of our Faith are contain'd; upon this Ground saith he, *I will prescribe, That what the Apostles have Preached, ought not to be proved any other way but by those Churches, which the Apostles themselves have founded either by Preaching to them by word of Mouth, or by Epistle. And if this be so, it is evident that all Doctrin, agreeing with the Doctrin of these Apostolical and Mother Churches, is suitable to Truth, and to be embrac'd without all doubt* (so infallible do's this Tradition make it.) And thus *Tertullian* goes on still pressing his Adversary, independently of all Scripture, meerly by the Tradition of this present Church, shewing her Pedegre from the primitive Church: And this way, and only this way, he prescribes

scribes that we ought to shew what *Christ* and his Apostles taught. And in the beginning of his Book *de Corona Militis*, his Doctrin comes very home in many things to our purpose: As first, When a Question is ask'd, Why we in this Church (whose Pedegree we can draw from the Apostles) do pray for the Dead? Pray to Saints? Worship the Eucharist, &c. the very asking of this Question, *Why do you do it?* proves that we do it. And because we every where do it in the Church, the observation of these practices is to stand good, because, we are *Habentes observationem inveteratam quæ præveniendo, statum fecit. Hanc si nulla Scriptura determinavit, certè consuetudo roboravit; quæ sine dubio, &c.* We have an observation which by prevention, having got a long standing prescription, has settled it self. And tho' no Scripture has determinately appointed this observance, yet custom has given it strength; which custom without all doubt came from Tradition; for how can a thing be in practice (so universally) if it were not at first deliver'd by Tradition? Now if you say, that even for such practices, deliver'd by Tradition, the Scripture must be alledg'd, all his whole following Discourse is fram'd against this Objection, and he musters up a number of things then observ'd by the Church (that is, in the first Two hundred years)

years) without any proof of Scripture, by the meer and sole title of Tradition. Thus much is very home Mr. Doctor; as also that among those most primitive observances he placeth, *Offering for the Dead*, and the even *wearing out our Forehead with making the Sign of the Cross at all kind of works we begin*: And tho' a Man may be sav'd who doth not practise these things, yet they being Apostolical Institutions, how can a Man be sav'd who contemns them? *It was not in vain*, saith St. Chrysostom, *Hom. in Ep. ad Philip.* And again, *Hom. 69. ad populum.* *It was not in vain decreed by the Apostles, That in the celebration of those most dreadful Mysteries, memory should be made of those who are dead: They knew well that much benefit and profit did hence redound unto them.* See if you are safe, who condemns that for superstitious, which the Apostles decreed as most beneficial to the Souls; of which I have spoken more *Sect. 19. N. 4.* And of St. *Austin's* Authority *Sect. 12. N. 3, 4, 5.* (and you must observe how he speaks of that which on the one side he held wholly necessary, as Infants Baptism, not Rebaptising Heretics, and yet now here set down in Scripture;) which is to come further home than Dr. Fern could wish. To these I add *Origen, Præfat. in Lib. Periarth.* *That only is to be believ'd for truth*
which

which in nothing disagrees from the Tradition of the Church: And in our understanding Scripture, we must not believe otherwise than the Church of God has by succession deliver'd unto us. Wherefore if all the World understood those words, *This is my Body*, concerning a most Real Corporal Presence, we must not believe otherwise. Again, because the public practice of the Church do's understand St. James (when he bids the Priests to be called for to anoint the Sick with Oyl, to obtain forgiveness of their Sins) to speak of a true Sacrament, he clearly teacheth by this her practice, that the Scripture should not be understood otherwise. The Authorities therefore of the Fathers, come home to our purpose when so often they inculcate this verity.

5. So also do those Fathers who profess themselves to receive such and such Books for Canonical upon Tradition. The very same *Rufinus* (who alone is found to deliver the whole Canon just as you do) in the words immediately going before the naming those Canonical Books, speaks thus in *Enarratione Symboli*: *It seems good distinctly to set down in this place which be the volumes of the New and Old Testament, which are believ'd to have been inspir'd by the Holy Ghost (mark the ground why) according to the Tradition of our Ancestors, as we have receiv'd them out*

U of

434 *The Roman Church is*

of the Monuments of our fore-fathers. Note that he here do's not only take the Canonical Books for Tradition, which most Protestants will say they themselves do, but he takes them to be Canonical for Tradition; and upon this ground he saith, *They were believ'd to have been inspir'd by the Holy Ghost.* See also what I said of the Council of Carthage and others, Sect. 3. Upon this ground St. Athanasius (*in fine Synopsis*) receives the Gospel of St. Matthew, and rejects the Gospel of St. Thomas. Upon this ground Tertullian, St. Hierom, St. Aug. St. Leo, do admit such Books to be, and deny others to be Canonical. Upon this ground St. Austin receives the Acts of the Apostles. See his words Sect. 22. *fine.* Hence also Eusebius saith in *Hist. Eccl. Lib. 3.* *Such Scriptures by Tradition are held for true, genuine, and manifestly allow'd by the Opinion of all, and that hence, as by an evident note or mark they are distinguish'd from others.* Behold the most perspicuous note or mark by which Scriptures could infallibly be known. If this Rule be fallible, we have no Infallibility of the Scriptures being or not being Canonical Writings. None of the Holy Fathers can be shew'd to have let fall one word insinuating, that by the light discover'd in such or such Books, they were assur'd, and that infallibly, of their being Canonical; of which I spoke, Sect. 3.

Sect.

Sect. 21.

That the Fathers teach in general the Church to be infallible.

1. **B**ESIDES those manifold Authorities which I have cited out of the Fathers, clearly teaching the Church infallible in her Traditions (by which and by her answerable practice, she makes known to her Children her Belief) and besides those other Authorities teaching, that this Church, in her Representative or General Councils, do's with the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost, set forth her Canons, or Rules for Belief and Practice; there be several other Authorities in which the Fathers, in very full expressions, declare their Belief of the Churches Infallibility: For whensoever the Fathers speak of the Churches being to be follow'd by us in all things most securely, as being a certain Guide or Rule; or when they use any such kind of speech, they either mean the Church Representative in a lawful Council, or the Church Universal, delivering such or such a Point by Tradition shining with conformable practice. Whence my Reader will observe, how the Fathers (whose Speeches of the Church in general

436 *The Roman Church is*

I am going to cite) when they use such general speeches, do confirm, by their Authority, what I have said of the Infallibility of the Church Representative in Councils, or of the like Infallibility of the Church Universal in her Traditions. And on the other side, all those manifold Authorities, by which Infallibility of Councils and Traditions have been already confirm'd by me, do also confirm this general Proposition, *That the Church is infallible*: That is, the Church as well Universal, speaking by Tradition; as Representative, speaking by a General Council.

2. Of this Infallibility in general thus St. Cyprian *de Unitate Eccl.* *The Church is the Spouse of Christ which cannot play the Adulteress.* And again, *Epist. 55.* *The Church never departs from what she once has known.* And St. Hierom thus, *Lib. 3. in Ruffinum.* *C. 8. fine.* *In her is the Rule or Square of Truth.* And thus also Ruffinus (*in Enarrat. Symbol.*) explicating those words; *I believe the Holy Catholic Church; she therefore is the Holy Church not having spot or wrinkle,* words spoken of Christs Visible Church on Earth, as appears as well by the words going before, which are, *In this Church there is one Faith, one Baptism;* as by the words following, *Many others have gather'd Churches together, as Marcian, Valentinus, Arius, &c. but those Churches*

Churches be not without spot and wrinkle. Had Christs only Church upon Earth been so foul (as you must of necessity say it was for a full Thousand years before your Reformation) she had notoriously play'd the Adulteress, and been indeed the Whore of Babylon, as you at every occasion call the only Church Christ then had, or as pure as any he then had. If this Church also had inter-iorly departed from what she receiv'd, she had play'd the Mistress of misrule, and not been the Rule and Square of Truth. Lastly, she had not been without most hideous spots, and far greater deformities than wrinkles. See how you have painted her out above in my Sect. 15. N. 8. How differently St. Irenæus, Lib. 3. C. 40. Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; but the Spirit is Truth. And Lactantius, Lib. 3. cap. ult. calls the Church, The well-spring of Truth, The dwelling place of Faith. You, who make the Church dwelling in Error so many Ages, joyn Error, and most intolerable Error, together with the Spirit of Truth. How was this Spirit of Truth in a Church imposing lies (as you say) for Divine Verities and exacting of all, under pain of Excommunication, to submit to her proceedings herein? And yet you can find Christ no better Church for the last

Thousand years. There be four Fathers for whose Testimonies divers of our Adversaries use to call, insomuch that they account their deep silence our condemnation, because those Fathers have treated expressly against Heretics, and undertaken how to direct others in the true Faith; and therefore doubtless, had they esteem'd the Church to have been infallible, they would have made her direction the first Rule of all. The first of these Fathers is *Vincentius Lirinensis*, whom I have already shew'd at large to stand mainly upon this direction. See his words cited *Sect. 7.* As for the second, who is *Tertullian*, he liv'd before the Church had or could have any General Council, by reason of the universal Persecution under those Heathenish Emperors; and so *Tertullian* do's not indeed speak of the Church Representative in Councils; yet he speaks home of the Infallibility of the Church Universal, declaring her Doctrine by her Tradition, and her practice conformable to her Tradition, and in all thus declar'd *Tertullian* holds her infallible; as I have already shew'd the last *Sect. N. 4.*

3. The third Father is *St. Epiphanius*, who how clearly he speaks of the Infallibility of the Church in her Traditions, we have seen in the same number:

number: I add here further an admirable saying of this Father of the Churches Infallibility; for having shewed, *Heref. 49.* how all Heresies seek to go by new found By-ways, he calls the following of the Church, *That Kings high way of which Moses spoke* (Mytically by the King of Edom) saying, *That he would pass by that, right on to the Land of Promise, neither declining at the Right-hand nor the Left, neither on this side nor on that, but we will go on streight in the Kings high-way. For the Kings high-way is the holy Church of God, the Road of Truth. But every one of these Heresies leaving this Kings high-way decline either on the Right-hand or on the Left to Error. But you, O Servants of God, you Sons of the Church of God, who have known the sure Rule, and do go on in the way of Truth, go on chearfully, and be not called back by their words and clamors, for their ways be erroneous.* So he. Here you have, that all Heresies agree in this, that they leave the infallible direction of the Church, and become Heretics by choosing out ways on their own Head, Erroneous ways, which in the Church never could have been met withal, *she being the Kings high-way, the beaten Road of Truth. the sure Rule, the way of Truth.* What more clear? To take the Churches direction as infallible, is the very bane of

Christendom, with Doctor *Fern*; with others it is the most intolerable Error in Popery, making all the Errors incurable; and yet this Ancient Holy Father, who (as St. *Austin* in his Book of Heresies saith) is the most learned Man that had written of Heresies, reprehends all and every one of these Heresies, for erring, by refusing to follow the Church, as a *sure Rule*, and as *the Kings high-way*, and as a *known Road of Truth*. Now if your censuring the Church for teaching herself to be this sure Rule and plain high-way of Truth, were just, St. *Epiphanius* did himself err most miserably, in imputing the denial of this to them all as an Error, of which every one of those Heretics stood guilty. It is therefore most false which a certain *University Man* (of whom I shall speak more in the next Chapter) over-rashly affirms, That neither St. *Epiphanius*, nor St. *Austin* in their Catalogues of Heretics, branded any one as guilty for gainsaying this infallible guidance of the Church. For you see St. *Epiphanius* brands all Heresies with this foul mark, saying, *That every of these Heresies leaving this Kings high-way of the Church (the sure Rule, and plain Road of Truth) declines either on the right-hand, or on the left.* And the same Father ending his Books of Heresies saith, *These*
be

be the young Wenches (so he reads that place of the Canticles, Cap. 6. v. 8.) which are said to be without number; and then to the Church he applies the next Verse, My Dove, my undefiled is but one, one is this Virgin, this chaste one, this Sponse, the holy City of God, the Faith, the Foundation of Truth, the firm Rock against which the Gates of Hell shall not prevail. And then going to give an abridgment of the Faith of the Catholic Church, he exults in the beginning, that he is now to have nothing to do with filthy Heresies, but has made his approach to the calm Coasts of Truth, to-wit, the Doctrin of the Church. And mark how secure from Errors he thinks himself here; For now (saith he) being free of all fear and trouble, and tediousness, and being in an excellent posture by reason of the firm tranquility and security here breathing, how did we rejoice in Spirit being received in a Serene Heaven? We have passed many evils in our Navigation, through the fore-said Seas (of Heresie) but now having in sight the City (of the Church) let us make hast to this Holy Jerusalem, and Virgin of Christ, and Sponse, and secure Foundation and Rock, our Reverend Mother, most seasonably saying: Let us ascend unto the Mountain of our Lord, and into the House of the God of Jacob, and she will teach us our ways (and not Errors, for how free she is from

them he farther expresseth.) *Let us speak to her these words which her Spouse did; Come my Spouse from Libanus, because thou art all fair, and there is not any spot in thee: (this he saith of the Visible Church on Earth, teaching us on Earth her ways, for presently he flieth to her thus;) to the end that being placed in thee, we may rest from those troublesome busineses of the foregoing Heresies, in thee our holy Mother the Church, and in thy holy Doctrin, and that we may be refreshed in the truth with the holy and only Faith of God.* And having spoken so full of this perfect security from Error in the Church. He tells us whence it proceeds; to wit, from the special assistance of God; and that she is not like thy Concubine Queens, but that she is Queen, as the true Spouse, *having for her dowry from Christ the receiving the holy Ghost.* And then having spent good part of this *Abridgment* in shewing, by the gross Errors among Gentiles, and Heretics, that their Faith was like the Concubins, which have no such Dowry from Christ, he returns to declare in divers particular Points the Faith of this chaste Virgin the Church, in which nevertheless he spends but a Leaf, and an half, according to my Book. This I note, because Dr. Fern, *Sett.* 30. wonders that in a Book of this Subject there should be no more mention of Popish Doctrins,

Doctrins, had they been the Doctrins of Antiquity. I think this Doctor never so much as read that Book, for if he had, he would have found that he speaks of no one Point of any true Christian Faith at all, until he comes to these three last Leaves, except it be of the admirable praises of the Church and of her Infallibility, or most safe, certain, and secure direction; which is the prime Point of Popish Doctrin. But whosoever shall come to answer that place of Dr. *Fern*, will tell him how many other Popish Points make up the other Leaf and Leaf following; all which Points are put down by St. *Epiphanius* as Traditions necessary to be deliver'd here by him.

4. St. *Epiphanius* was most wrongfully accus'd by that University-man of silence, concerning this Point of Infallibility (which he so much extols, whereas he should have put it for one of the Heresies, if he had been one of your Religion:) so also is St. *Austin* no less wronged, who is the fourth Father whose silence of this Infallibility they object: And first, say they, he calls no Man Heretic for denying of it; whereas all Heretics mentioned by him in his Books of Heresie, could not but deny it according to us, or else they had not been Heretics. A strange Argument

Argument you say, because all Heretics deny'd this; therefore he should have at least noted this in some one of them. I contrariwise say, because every one of these Heretics deny'd this, therefore it had been ridiculous to express it concerning any one of them, as if he had been singular in that one which is common to all, and every one (for Example,) Were it not ridiculous in the Catalogue of Canonical Books, put down in the front of the Bible, to say of some particular Books, for Example, of the Book *Leviticus*, or the Book of *Judges*, *this Book is the true Word of God*. And would not such an addition, make them think, that the being the true Word of God, was less common to other Books, or that there were some special doubt of these two Books. Just so it would be ridiculous to say such Heretics held the Church fallible, a thing common to all Heretics. Therefore you see St. *Epiphanius*, when he was speaking of any particular Heresie, did not say what he said of that particular Heresie, but he said, *Every one of these Heresies do this*; there never being any special doubt concerning any one single Heresie, whether it did do that or no, which all Heresies must needs do; insomuch that to give you a Catalogue of Heretics, is the self same thing that it is to give up a List of
such.

such Men, who teaching a Doctrine, differing from the Church to be true, must needs teach her Doctrine to be false; and consequently that she did Err, and is fallible; and therefore a Judge not to be submitted unto in those her Errors. Neither did St. *Austin* omit to note this, if you omit not to note well what he says. First in the beginning, he puts down the Epistle of *Quod vult Deus*, intreating him to write this Book, *that he might know what Heresies there have been? What they did hold contrary to the Catholic Church? And also what on the contrary the Catholic Church has declar'd against them?* These two Questions St. *Austin* takes special notice of in his Preface to his Book, repeating them in the words in which they were propos'd by *Quod vult Deus*. And then he begins to satisfy his first Question by telling him what every Heresie has held contrary to the Catholic Church. Do you not here see how, on all sides, it is supposed that every Heresie held something to be true which the Church held to be false; and that therefore every Heresie must needs teach that the Church is guilty of Errors, and being Mistress of Errors cannot be infallible in deciding all Points truly? A little skill in *Equipollentibus* (to which those arrive who have passed the Bridge) would have made an University Man see

see a thing so clear. Especially being the second Question makes the first yet more clear, by acknowledging that it is the part of the Church to declare her meaning against Heretics, which is to acknowledge her the Judge in these matters; for this Question was to know *quid contra teneat Ecclesia quantum instructioni satis est subdi*, that as much as was necessary for instruction might be told him concerning the contrary Judgment of the Church. St. Austin comes not to touch in the least word this second demand, until the end of his Book, and then he cuts him off thus: *It is superfluously demanded (what you expected to be told by me) what the Catholic Church judgeth against all these, seeing that for this end (of having as much instruction as is necessary) it is sufficient to know that the Catholic Church is of a contrary judgment to all these. Therefore every Christian Catholic ought not to believe these things.* Behold here the Judgment of the Church, so much esteem'd, that we have as much as is sufficient for our instruction to avoid any opinion, when we do but know that the Church judgeth the contrary, and to desire to know more, is superfluous; for this alone is enough to make any Christian Catholic not to be of a judgment contrary to the judgment of the Church. Could any Pope in these our days have spoken more Papistically?

If

If you were to make a Catalogue of gross Errors, and Errors incurable, you would put this down in Capital Letters.

5. Let this then be *the first Authority* of St. *Austin* for the Infallibility of the Church; that we have enough to disbelieve any Opinion, when she bids us disbelieve it; whence it evidently follows, that we have sufficient to believe any thing, because she bids us believe it, her Authority being as well assur'd for the one, as for the other. *A Second* very full place I gave you *Sect. 19. N. 7.* *Thirdly*, It is notorious that St. *Austin* often professeth (see his words which I shall cite presently) that Baptism given by Heretics is to be held of infallible validity; and this, not because it is set down in any Scripture (for he confesseth it is clearly set down in no Scripture,) but because the Church in a Plenary Council has declar'd it to be so; as he often urgeth in the beginning of *his fourth Book de Baptismo*, and there, *Chap. 4.* he holds the validity of the Baptism given by Heretics to be a Point *reveal'd by the Holy Ghost*; to-wit, when the Apostles deliver'd this Tradition first to the Church, as he intimates there, *Chap. 6.* This Revelation, made by the Holy Ghost of this Point, did then grow to oblige all to assent unto it, when it was notifi'd to the Church by a Plenary Council

cil after St. Cyprians days, as the same Saint also teaches. *Fourthly*, He accounts it also to have proceeded from the Holy Ghost, that we are oblig'd to Communicate before we Eat any thing; which Will of the Holy Ghost is not notifi'd to us by any Scripture; but the Church is of sufficient Authority to notifie this Will of the Holy Ghost, and to make it obligatory. His words are, *It is manifest that when the Disciples received the Body and Blood of our Lord, they did not receive fasting: Must we therefore calumniate the Universal Church for always receiving fasting?* For hence it is that it has pleas'd the Holy Ghost, that in the honor of so great a Sacrament, the Body of our Lord should enter into the Mouth of a Christian before external Meats. For this cause this Custom is kept through the whole world, Epist. 118. ad Januarium. *Fifthly*, St. Austin Lib. 7. de Baptismo, C. 53. treating of a Question in which nothing was yet defin'd by the Church, says; *It is not safe for us rashly to deliver our Opinion in this matter, which is not determin'd by any Council, but let our care be (says he) to affirm that to be (securæ vocis) a thing to be spoken securely, which in the Government of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is confirm'd by the confession of the Universal Church.* No danger of Error in this speech; For I ask you, were you not (without fear of being lead into Error)

Error) securely to rely upon the testimony of that party whom *Christ* should bid you believe? You dare not but say, Yes. Read then *Sixthly St. Austin*, and mark how fully he tells you, that what the Church tells you, is told by one, upon whose testimony *Christ* did bid you rely; and mark how he infers from hence, that as not to hear such a person, whom *Christ* did bid you hear in such a Controversie, were rather to reject *Christ*, than to reject such a person; so not to hear the Church, whom he did bid you hear in all Controversies, is not so much to reject her, as to reject *Christ*. See if he speaks not to this effect as fully as I have done. Thus then he writes, *de Unitate fidei*, C. 19. Let now an Heretic say unto me, how do you admit of me into your Communion? (he speaks of such an one as was Baptiz'd by Heretics) Then he reply'd; I readily Answer you. I admit of you as that Church admits of you, to which Church our Saviour gives Testimony. Do you know better, how you ought to be admitted of, than our Saviour? Here perhaps you will say, Read unto me then (out of Scripture) in what manner *Christ* has commanded those to be admitted of, who desire to pass from Heretics to the Church? This clearly and manifestly (set down in Scripture) neither I do read nor you. Now then, seeing that in the Scripture we find not that any who passed from

from the Heretics to the Church, were admitted of, either as I say (without being Rebaptiz'd) or as you say (by first Rebaptizing of them) I am of opinion, that if there should have been some wise Man, to whom our Lord Jesus Christ gives testimony, and this (wise) Man were consulted by us, we ought by no means to doubt of doing that, which he should say, lest that we should be judged not so much to be refractory to this (wise) Man as to be refractory to Christ our Lord, by whose testimony he was commended (to be heard.) But Christ do's give testimony to his Church. If then thou wilt not (be admitted of as she admits of thee) thou do'st most perniciously resist not me, or any Man, who will thus admit of thee, but thou do'st most perniciously resist our Saviour himself, contrary to thy Salvation (that is, damnably) being that thou wilt not believe that thou oughtest to be admitted of in such a manner, as that Church do's admit of thee, which Church he, by his testimony, do's commend, he (I say) whom you your selves confess that it is a wicked thing not to believe. So he, and no Papist could speak more clearly, to declare the damnable Sin of being refractory to the Church, even when she has no other Scripture for what she bid, than that Scripture which bids us hear and obey her. To which purpose Seventhly, Lib. 6. 1. Contra Crescon. cap. 33. speaking of the very

very self same Point in which the Churches infallible Authority without other Scripture is to be wholly relied upon, to-wit, *That Baptism given by Heretics is true Baptism.* Therefore altho' truly concerning this thing no example can be brought out of the Canonical Scriptures, yet even in this very thing the truth of the same Scriptures is held by us, when we do that which has pleas'd the Church; which Church the Authority of the same Scripture do's commend, that because the holy Scripture cannot deceive, whosoever fears to be deceived by the obscurity of this Question, let him go and consult the Church concerning the same (obscure Question) which Church the Holy Scripture without all doubtfulness do's demonstrate to us. Behold here St. Austin, in a necessary Point of Faith (which after the Scriptures perused is still obscure) frees us from all fear of Erring; if, even in such a Point, we rely on the Church as infallible. Hence Eightly on Psal. 57. he writes thus: *It may be that a Man may lie, but it cannot be that Truth can lie. From the Mouth of Truth I acknowledged Christ Truth it self. From the Mouth of Truth I acknowledged the Church partaker of Truth.* Behold, that to a Man subject to lie, he opposeth first Christ Truth it self by essence; secondly he opposeth the Church Truth by Participation of his Truth; both of them infallible or

not:

not subject to lie, as Man is. Ninthly, Having deliver'd the Doctrin of the Church concerning Baptising Children (which Point as I shew'd, *Seet. 8. N. 5.* he held not to be clearly set down in Scripture) he accounts himself by the Churches Authority alone so infallibly grounded in this Point, that he breaks forth into these words, *Serm. 14. de verbis Apostol. cap. 18. The Authority of our Mother the Church has this. This is made good by the grounded Rule of Truth. Against this strength, against this insuperable Wall whosoever rusheth shall be crush'd.* A place so convincing, that those great defenders of your Cause in the famous Conference of Ratisbon, were forc'd to answer to it thus; *In this Point we freely dissent from Austin. In Protocol. Monach. edit. 2. Pag. 367.* But let them take what the same St. Austin tenthly saith, *Ep. ad Januar. 118. cap. 5. If the whole Church through the World practise any thing, it is most insolent madness to dispute whether that ought to be practis'd or no.* So he. Now this by no means could be true without the Church were infallible. For a wise Man may with modesty dispute against that, which may well be an Error. Eleventhly, Because the Enemies of the Infallibility of the Church use to fright the defenders thereof with a fond fear of being misled blindly

blindly by her Prelates, who may (say they) even in Councils err: St. Austin answers for us thus, *Epist. 166. fine. Inasmuch as he makes his people secure from ill Governors, lest for them the Chair of wholesome Doctrine should be forsaken, in which even the evil are constrain'd to deliver true things. For they are not their own things which they say, but Gods, who has placed the Doctrine of Verity in the Chair of Unity; whence he says, Do what they say, but according to their works do you not, Mat. 23. So he.*

6. *Twelfthly*, This Prince of Doctors, has a place which I will ponder apart, not only because he says clearly as much as we could wish, but chiefly, because he proves unanswerably what he says. And therefore this Authority is not answer'd without answering the Arguments which he presseth like a Master Disputant, demonstrating clearly, why, at the very writing of this, he refus'd to be a *Manichean*, and why every one, both Infidels and Christians, ought to refuse the same. I will put his Golden Discourse at large, adding a short Paraphrasis, to put my Reader in mind of such reflections as deserve to be made of so admirable words. This place is *Lib. contra Epist. Fundamenti cap. 4. The Epistle of Manicheus* (which the *Manicheans* would have pass for Gospel) begins thus, *Manicheus the Apostle of*
Jesus

Jesus Christ by the providence of God the Father. I ask therefore (saith St. Aug.) who this Manicheus is? you will answer, the Apostle of Christ: I do not believe it. Perhaps you will read the Gospel unto me, endeavouring thence to prove it. And what if you did light upon one who did not believe the Gospel? what would you do then, if such an one should say unto you, I do not believe you. This is his Argument to prove, why an Infidel has no reason to be a Manichean, because you Manicheans (you Lutherans and Calvinist's) who deny the Authority of the Church, by taking away her Infallibility, leave no infallible Authority upon which any Man can safely rely in admitting the Gospel for the undoubted Word of God. Wherefore St. Austin tells them, that they destroying this ground, leave him no infallible ground to believe the Gospel more than Infidels do believe it. Wherefore he adds, But I would not (because now you have left me no sufficient, that is, no infallible ground for it) But I would not believe the Gospel unless the Authority of the Church did move me thereunto. Here is the first place, where he tells you, the Church is esteem'd by him so sure a ground, (which it could not be were it a fallible ground) that upon it alone he builds the belief of this Article; The Scripture is the Word of God: I say, he builds

builds the belief of this upon this ground alone, because he tells us, if it were not for this ground, he would not believe this fundamental Point, whence appears the weakness of our Adversaries best answer; which is, that St. *Austin* only tells us here, what occasionally mov'd him, when he was a *Manichean*, first to believe the Gospel; so that the sense (say they) is this; I, when I was a *Manichean*, would not have believ'd the Gospel, had it not been that the Churches Authority had first occasionally mov'd me thereunto. But I pray reflect how clear it is by St. *Austin's* words, that he gives an absolute universal reason, why, at the very writing of this Discourse, he receiv'd the Gospel for Gods true Word, so mov'd thereunto by the Authority of the Church, that were it not for her Authority, he would not believe the Gospel to be the Word of God. If he should only have told the *Manicheans*, what he had done at his first Conversion occasionally upon a ground; which ground now he himself thought unsufficient, for such an infallible Assent, he had given them no kind of satisfaction; neither could he have urg'd them still (as he do's) that he, in rejecting *Manicheans* must needs rely (as upon sure ground) on the same Authority upon which he first relying was most

most groundedly induced to give credit to the Scripture. The Truth then is, that St. *Austin* told them, that neither Infidels could believe them (they only citing Gospel,) nor Catholics could believe them, because they only cited that Gospel against the Church, which he himself with all Catholics believed only to be true Gospel for the Authority of the Church. Whence it follows in him; *Why should not I (now at the writing of these) obey them (the Prelates of the Church) saying unto me, Do not obey Manicheus to whom I obeyed, saying believe the Gospel.* Note here, that he tells you he had so good a ground for what he did, that even now this motive, as an invincible motive, prevails with him; for he still makes it good thus: *Choose which you please. If you say, believe the Catholics; they admonish me to give no credit to you. Wherefore believing them I cannot but disbelieve you. But if you say, do not believe the Catholics; then you do not take a right course to force me, by the Gospel, to believe Manicheus; (I pray mark this reason) Because I believe the Gospel it self, the Catholics Preaching it unto me. But if you say (to me) you have rightly believed the Catholics praising the Gospel, but you have not rightly believ'd them dispraising Manicheus; do you think me so very a fool, that no reason being rendred for it,*

it, I will believe what you list, and disbelieve what you list, except you do not only bid me believe what you will, but you also, most manifestly and evidently, make me know it. If you be (as you will say) going to give me such a reason as shall make it manifestly and evidently known to me that the Catholics Erred, in the bidding me not believe *Manicheus*, but that they Erred not in the bidding me receive the Gospel, what then? *Dimitte Evangelium. Bid Farewel to the Gospel.* (Why?) Because if you hold your self to the Gospel (upon a ground that cannot deceive you) I (for my part) will hold my self to those, through whose teaching I have believed the Gospel, and at their command I will not believe thee. Behold, St. *Austin* tells them, that even now, he will not believe them, because even now he believes the Gospel at their teaching, by whose command he is not to believe you. I pray what had this Answer been to the purpose, if St. *Austin* had thought the Catholics now to be believed with assent less than infallible? For if he had thought they could have misled him in bidding him believe the Gospel, he might have thought they could also mislead him in bidding him not believe *Manicheus*. But you will say, he thought they might bring manifest and evident demonstrations for this last, because he insinuates that if

X

they

they did so, he would believe them, even when they said *he had reason to believe the Church praising the Gospel, but not to believe it dispraising Manicheus.* Whereas from that which we hold infallible, no reason shall remove us. I Answer, that he who saith to a Man of another Religion, I do not mean to pass to your Religion, except you can shew me by manifest and evident demonstration that my Religion is false; do's he, by this saying intimate that he do's not give infallible assent to the Religion he is now of? For one may say to an Atheist, *I will die for my belief in the Scripture, except you evidently can demonstrate that the Scripture is false, and cannot be Gods word.* In these speeches a Mans meaning is, that until you can shew me that you have done this (which I am sure you cannot shew me) you have no reason to find fault with me for not passing over unto you. I prove this to be so here if I may but suppose (a thing most true) that *St. Austin* did, with an infallible assent believe the Gospel. For I pray observe, if he speaks not of his intending to forsake his belief in the very Gospel it self, if the Manicheans can shew by Scripture that any Doctin contrary to the belief of the Church can be true. So impossible did he hold it to shew the Church infallible in any
one

one Point. For even thus he says; *If perhaps in the Gospel thou shalt be able to find any place that is manifest to prove Manicheus a true Apostle, then indeed you shall weaken unto me the Authority of the Catholics bidding me not believe thee* (by shewing their Authority is fallible.) Be pleas'd to reflect attentively on what follows; *This Authority (of the Catholics) being weakned, now I cannot so much as believe the Gospel.* The word (*now*) shews that at the very writing of this, he professeth, that if the Catholics Authority could, but in any one single Point, be shewed fallible, *he cannot now believe the Gospel*, because says he, *by those Catholics, I had believ'd the Gospel*, whom you have now in one Point shewed fallible. Here some of our Adversaries catch hold on those words, *because by those Catholics I had believed*; whereas, say they, If he had meant their Authority had been the Cause of this belief, he should not have used the particles, *Per, by, or through*, but the Particle *Propter* For. A weak Objection, for how often in Scripture do's this Particle, *By*, express the true Cause upon which, and only which Men believ'd infallibly, as all did first *by or through* the Preaching of Christ. So Jo. 17. v. 20. Christ Pray's, not only for his Apostles, but also *for them which should believe*

460 *The Roman Church is*

in him by or through their words. And St. Paul 2 *Thes.* 2. 15. would have us *stand fast and hold the Traditions which have been taught us by word, or by his Epistle.* What was held by those Authorities was held by them with Infallibility. *That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have strong consolation;* Heb. 6. 18. Weaker than this is another cavel, that St. *Austin* could not esteem the Church infallible, because for a clear place in Scripture he would have denied her Infallibility: For according to this fond cavelling reason, he should have also esteemed the Scripture fallible, because he likewise says, *the Catholics Authority being weakened, now I cannot so much as believe the Gospel.* The truth then is, that he speaks with an Heretic denying the Churches Infallibility, and disputing against it out of Scripture; wherefore he speaks just with him, as we use to speak with you, doing the like; that is, he tells him only what should happen if his impossibilities were shewed to be realities. And first he says, that unless his open Falsities can be demonstrated out of the true Word of God, (which is one impossibility) he would not believe them. Secondly, He even after the performance of this impossibility tells him, he has yet another Answer, to-wit, that he will
neither

neither believe him speaking that, which he could shew to be clear Gospel, neither would he believe the Church any more, because she had taught him to believe that to be Gods true Word, which notwithstanding did bear clear witness to that which she taught to be a Lie; Whence he, seeing her in one Point fallible, would never rely on her so as to believe the Scripture upon her Authority, as then he did. You shall see how clearly he says this; *Wherefore (saith he) if in the Gospel no manifest place be found concerning the Apostleship of Manicheus, I will rather believe the Catholics than thee; but if thou shalt read me out of the Gospel any place manifestly for Manicheus, I will neither believe them, nor thee. I will not believe them, because they have lied unto me concerning thee (this one Lie shewing their Church to be fallible) neither will I believe thee (even citing clear Scripture as thou callest it) because thou citest to me that Scripture to which I gave credit by those who have lied unto me.* Which words be perfect non-sense, without you say, the Scripture in St. Austins Opinion loseth (in order to us) her Infallibility, if the Catholic Church can tell one Lie: For in that Case St. Austin says, he would forsake both Church and Scripture also, if any clear place in Scripture should say, Manicheus was a true Apostle. And he

says that for that cause, and upon that ground he would forsake Scripture, because it was that Scripture, which he only did hold to be so, by the Authority of the Catholic Church, which now he had taken in one Lie. But for all this, says he, *God forbid I should not believe the Gospel*; for thou canst not bring any thing to make me believe either the Church, or that which is commended for Gods Word by the Church, to be contrary to Truth. *For even believing the Gospel I do not find how I can believe thee*, there being in the Gospel nothing for thee. And then he shews, how clearly he finds the Acts of the Apostles to be against them: *Which Book* (says he) *it is necessary for me to believe, if I do believe the Gospel*. Note first how he speaks of the belief he had now at the very writing of these, saying, that he must believe this Book, which is a Book rejected by the Manicheans. Whence it is manifest that he speaks of himself as now a Catholic, and such a Catholic as received only such Books for Gods true Word, as the Church recommended to him for such; holding also her recommendation so sure, that she could not fail in recommending any one Book for Gods Word, which was not of necessity to be held so, meerly upon her recommendation; For thus he proves, that

that it was then necessary for him to believe this Book (of the Acts of the Apostles, which the Manicheans held to be no Scripture) if he believes the Gospel, *Because the Catholic Authority* (of the Church) *do's in like manner commend both Scriptures unto me, to-wit, as well the Acts, as the four Gospels; for indeed it is proper to those who believe the Church fallible, to believe her only when they think fitting: Whereas those who with St. Austin believe her infallible, must needs speak as he do's, that being the Church proposeth this to be believed, as well as that, it is necessary for me to believe this on her Authority as well as that.*

Sect. 22.

That all which the Fathers say of the Infallibility of the Church in her Traditions or Councils, or in general Terms, is meant by them particularly of the Roman Church, as we understand the Roman Church.

I Must now take away from our Adversaries their last shift, which is, that altho' St. Austin and so many other Fathers speak so often of the Infallibility of the Traditions of the Church, and of the Councils of the Church, and of the Churches Authority in general; yet, say they, what is this to the Roman Church,

more than to the *English*, which is a part of the Catholic as well as the *Roman*; she only being a part and not the whole Catholic Church? I Answer, that when we say the Church is infallible, we speak, as Antiquity useth to speak of the Church; that is, we speak of it, as of a Flock adhering to their true Head-Pastor; and consequently we speak of the Church of *Rome* in this sense, as she is a Church Catholic, that is, universally comprehending all the Sheep of *Christ*, living in any Nation though never so far from *Rome*, yet joyn'd in Communion to the Bishop of *Rome*, as to her Head-Pastor: For thus the *Roman Church*, as comprehending all Churches united to her Communion, cannot be shewed in any time since *Christ*, to have differ'd in Doctrin from what the Universal Church ever taught, or practised: If therefore the Universal Church, following Tradition, be by the guidance of the same Tradition infallibly conducted, according to the Opinion of the Fathers; the *Roman Church*, ever treading the very self-same steps, must needs have proceeded as infallibly. Again, if the Church representative be infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost, as I have proved, the self-same must needs be true of the *Roman Church*, whoever was joyn'd in

in Communion and Unity of Doctrine with every lawful General Council which has been from *Christ's* time to this. For it is so notorious, that our Adversaries cannot deny it, that the Bishop of *Rome* either by himself, or by his Legates in his name, has presided in every such Council, and subscrib'd unto it in the very first and chief place, or at least he did send his Confirmation and Ratification of all the Acts thereof. Her Doctrine has then always agreed with all Lawful Councils: If their Decrees be infallible Rules, as I have proved, then the *Roman* Churches Doctrine, ever ruled by them, is infallible. And the same Fathers who say the Doctrine agreeing with Councils is infallible, also by manifest consequence say, that the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church is infallible. This being so notorious, no wonder if the Fathers many times promiscuously speak in the same manner of the *Roman* Church, and of the Church in general, and take the one for the other, making no distinction at all. And this they do both for the reasons before said, as also because by the very name of the Church they understood the Flock of *Christ* grounded by *St. Peter*, and his Successors as their Lawful Pastor appointed by *Christ*. And just as the Apostle tells us, *that Christ did purchase a Church unto*

466 *The Roman Church is*

himself by his Blood: So St. Chrysostom. lib. 2. de Sacerd. asking, Why Christ did shed his Blood? Answers, That he might purchase unto himself his Sheep, the charge of which he committed both to Peter and his Successors. Hence you see that with him the Church Universally is one and the self-same thing, that the Flock of Christs Sheep, govern'd by St. Peters Successor the Bishop of Rome: So St. Cyprian tells us Epist. 69. That the Church is a People united to their Priests, and a Flock adhering to their Shepherd. Hence Venerable Bede lib. 2. Hist. Eccl. cap. 2. says, Pope Greg. govern'd the Church in the days of Mauritius the Emperor. And St. Gregory, lib. 4. Dial. c. 40. says, the Church refused Laurence to be her Governor when Symmachus was chosen Pope. He used the stile of St. Irenæus, lib. 3. cap. 3. who says, that to Linus (the Successor of St. Peter) the Apostles gave the charge of governing the Church; taking the Roman Bishops charge promiscuously for the charge of the Universal Church. And St. Jerome, Epist. 58. ad Damasum. If any one be joyned to the Chair of St. Peter, Meus est, he is of my Religion. And Again, Ep. 57. to the same Pope he speaks thus: To thy Holiness, that is, to the Chair of St. Peter, I am joyn'd in Communion; upon this Rock (so he calls St. Peters Chair) I know the Church is built. He is profane, who-

whoſoever he is, who who eats the Lamb out of this Houſe. He who is not in the Ark of Noah ſhall periſh in the Deluge. And St. Leo, Ep. 84. ad Anaſt. c. 11. ſheweth diſtinctly, how in the Church there is ſuch ſubordination of the People to their Biſhop, and of theſe to their higher Biſhops, and of all higher Biſhops to the Biſhop of Rome; that by them the charge of the Universal Church might be referr'd to that one Chair of Peter, ſo nothing any where ſhould diſagree from their Head. St. Jerome again, 1. ad Tim. 3. ſays, That Pope Damasus was Rector of that Houſe of God, which St. Paul called the Pillar and Foundation of Truth. And St. Ambroſe, in Oratione ſuneb. de obitu fratris ſui Satyri, praiſeth his Brother Satyrus for his care in chooſing a Catholic Biſhop by this Rule, that he inquired whether they agreed with the Catholic Biſhops, that is, with the Roman Church: So he, taking the Catholic and Roman for all one. Hence St. Cyprian calls the Biſhop of Rome, the Biſhop of the Catholic Church. We know Cornelius to have been elected by Almighty God and Chriſt our Lord, the Biſhop of the moſt Holy Catholic Church; Neither are we Ignorant that there ought to be one God, one Chriſt our Lord, one Holy Ghoſt, one Biſhop in the Catholic Church. So he lib. 3. Ep. 11. And again, de Unitate Eccleſiæ. Do's he conſide himſelf to be in the Church, who
for

forsakes the Chair of Peter, upon which the Church is founded? Whence it is evident, that by the Church he meant the multitude of Believers adhering to the Chair of the Bishop of Rome. So also the most ancient Pope Anacletus, not Fourscore years after our Saviors death, speaks thus, in the end of his First Epistle registred among the Decretals and Councils, The Apostles by the Command of our Savior have appointed that the greater and harder Questions should always be referr'd to the Apostolical Seat, upon which Christ has built the Universal Church, he himself saying, Thou art Peter (that is, a Rock) and upon this Rock I will build my Church: So he. Hence I have the very ground why the Fathers promiscuously by the name of the Church, Universally understood the Roman Church, upon whose Seat the Universal was built. And this ground is made good by a world of Fathers in Coccius, where he treats of the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

2. That which is for my present intent, is to shew, that the Fathers, and why the Fathers, do take the name of *the Church* promiscuously for the *Roman Church*, tho' they do not name her by that name, because it was so notorious that by the name of the Church they meant no other thing than *Christs Flock* under their true Shepherd

herd the Bishop of *Rome*: And when it is once notoriously known to the hearers what is meant by such a word, the use of it is sufficiently determinate. So here in *England*, when with one another we say the Parliament did Decree or Examine such a thing, we are known notoriously to speak of the English Parliament: Tho' the word *Parliament* be as indifferent to signifie the French Parliament, especially if spoken by French to French in the middle of *France*, as I have further declar'd, *Seet. 7.* towards the end. I note also, that all that I here in the last Sections cited out of the Fathers for the Infallibility of the Church in her Traditions and Councils, must needs be spoken of no other Church than of such an one as did not disclaim from Infallibility; but all Churches but the *Roman*, disclaim'd from Infallibility; therefore they taught no other Church but the *Roman* to be infallible. If you ask why they must needs teach no Church to be infallible which disclaim'd from being so, I have given you a most evident reason thereof, *Seet. 17.*

3. This Note shews, that the Fathers must needs have in those Sayings of theirs concerning Infallibility, understood the *Roman* Church, and could understand no other differing from her. But indeed

deed (as I have said) their very vulgar phrase of Catholic Church, was known then to be applied to the *Roman*, taken in the sense we spoke of. Hence that old *Arian Jovianus* said to King *Theodoric*; If you put *Armogastes* (a Catholic) to death, the Romans (that is, the Catholics) will proclaim him a Martyr, as witnesseth *Victor Uti. de Persec. Vand. lib. 1.* Hence also *Ricamer* another *Arian*, did write unto the *Gennenses*. If he be a Catholic, he is a Roman. And *St. Greg. of Tours, lib. 1. de gloria Martyr. cap. 25.* telling how *Theodegesilus* an *Arian* King of *Portugal* said, such a Miracle was a trick of the Romans; he adds this Parenthesis, For they call the Men of our Religion Romans. So he. This then was the vulgar old Stile. Thus spoke Antiquity, If he be one of Christs Sheep, he is one of St. Peter's Successors Flock, as I shew'd out of *St. Chrysostom*: If he be of the Catholic Church, he is one of the People united to this Chief Priest, as I shew'd out of *St. Cyprian*. If mention be made of one to whom the Charge of Governing the Church is given, the Bishop of Rome is understood in the vulgar Language of the primitive Church, as I shew'd out of *Bede, St. Gregor. St. Irenaus*. If a *St. Hierom* would tell you, who were of his Church or Communion, he understands every one

joynd

joyn'd to the Chair of St. Peter; for upon
this Rock he knows the Church is built. If a
St. Leo speaks of one who has the charge of
the Universal Church, he means the Bishop
who sits in the Chair of St. Peter. If a St.
Hierom will signifie a Damasus Bishop of
Rome, he will do it by calling him, The
Rector of the House of God, which is the
Church, the Pillar and Foundation of Truth.
If a St. Ambrose or his Brother, be to pick
out among Schismatics, a Bishop who is
a true member of the Catholic Church,
he will do it by asking, *Whether he agrees
with the Catholic Bishop*; and he will tell
you, that in plain terms, by that name
he means the Roman Church. And if a St.
Cyprian be to speak of a Cornelius Bishop of
the Roman Church, he will explicate
himself in current language, by calling
him, *Bishop of the Catholic Church*, he being
notoriously known to be that one Bishop
which must be at all times in the Church, and
no Man can confide that he is in the Catholic
Church, who forsakes the Chair of St. Peter.
You need not then wonder to hear me
say, that by those who are in the Catho-
lic Church, we mean those who have
not forsaken, but cleave fast to the Chair
of St. Peter, for on this Apostolical Seat Christ
has built the Universal Church, as the most
ancient Anacletus has told you. Hence a
St. Austin (Epist. 162.) will tell Cecilian,
that

that he needs not fear the conspiring multitude of *African* Bishops as long as he communicated with *Melchisedes* the Pope. Hence *Optatus l. 2. contra Parmenian.* will thrust the *Donatists* out of the number of Catholics, *because they communicated not with the Roman Church*: And he himself will adhere to *Sericius* the Pope, *to whom all the World was united.* All the World then were Papists; and those counted Heretics who refus'd to be so. And in this sense not to be a Papist, that is, not to be one united in Communion to the Pope, was the self same as not to be Catholic; for all the Catholic World was united to the Pope or Head-Pastor of *Christ's* Flock.

4. Besides all this, you must know, that the Fathers did not always forget to express themselves concerning the Infalibility of the Church of *Rome* by name; or as significantly as if they had put that name. In my *Sect. 19. N. 7.* I cited *St. Austins* words at large, to prove, that God has left some such Authority unto us; *that by it, as by a well assured Step we may be lifted up to God*: And hence he concludes, that no Man should doubt to betake himself to the lap of the *Roman* Church, for this Church you will find his words evidently to describe. Read them and you cannot deny it. Again,
Psal.

Psalm in Partem Donati he speaks thus of St. Peters Chair. *She is that Rock which the proud Gates of Hell cannot vanquish.* And St. Cyprian, Ep. 55. N. 6. *They are so bold as to carry Letters from prophane Schismatics to the Chair of Peter, and the principal Church whence Priestly Unity rose, not considering the Romans to be them, whose Faith (the Apostle being the Commender thereof) was prais'd, to whom Misbelief cannot have access.* And St. Hierom *Apologia adver. Ruff.* L. 3. cap. 4. *Know you, that the Roman Faith commended by the Apostles mouth, will receive no such deceits, nor can possibly be chang'd tho' an Angel taught otherwise.* Our Adversaries commonly receive the Sixth General Synod celebrated A. 680. in which, after the Epistle of Agatho the Pope had been read, (Aet. 4.) it was confirm'd by these words (Aet. 8.) *This is the true Rule of Faith, which the Apostolical Church of Christ has vigorously held, and still defends; which Church shall never be prov'd to have err'd from the Path of Apostolical Tradition:* (And that you may know this was to hold true for ever, the Council adds) *According to the Divine Promise of our Lord and Saviour, I have pray'd for thee, that thy Faith may not fail.* Here you have the very phrase we now use of impossibility of erring grounded in the Divine Promise. What is this call'd
but

but Infallibility? The same Divine Promise is just so applied to St. Peter's Successors by St. Leo, *Serm. 3. in Annivers. suum*: If we will speak with Antiquity, here is *Aperta promissio*, a manifest promise that the Pastor of the Church, St. Peter's Successor proceeding as Universal Pastor, or defining in a Council, neither shall nor can fail, for which promise Dr. Fern *Sect. 27.* calls so earnestly.

5. By this time my Reader will see how exceeding little reason our Adversaries have to take for a strong Argument against Infallibility the deep silence of Antiquity (as they speak) in this Point; whereas I in a very short time, with my small reading, have been able so to weary out my Reader with the plentiful Authorities of Antiquity, that he will easily remember hereafter what just indignation ought to be conceived against this gross falsity.

Sect. 23.
Some things very necessary for the easier answering our Adversaries Objections.

1. **B**Efore I begin any one of our Adversaries Objections I must (to take away all prejudice) intreat my Reader

der in the whole reading of this next Section to note, *First*, How infallibly all the Christian World, except some few *Socinians*, affirm themselves to believe all things contain'd in those Books which they hold Canonical Scripture; and yet I will undertake that any judicious Man in the World, who with a calm, sober, and disinterrested mind shall attentively ponder on the one side what they object against the Infallibility of the Church; and then on the other side, all those exceeding many places of Scripture which seem so manifestly contrary to one another, that the greatest Wits that ever yet were, could never clear them so, but still the difficulty which remains is so very great, that no full satisfaction would ever be receiv'd, if Mens Wills were bent as resolutely to receive no answer but a manifest one against the Infallibility of Scripture as the Wills of Protestants are bent to reject all we can say in answer to their Objections against Infallibility of the Church, unless our Answers be more manifestly evident than the Noon Sun-shine: Wherefore in this matter due respect to Divine Authority makes us always so far submit our Understandings, by force of our Will, that, if the contrary be not (as I may say) more than evident, we are resolv'd to yield

yield no Assent unto it. Any Man who should ponder this on the one side, and then with due attention consider on the other side, how very few the Objections against the Infallibility of the Church are, in comparison of the Objections against the Infallibility of Scripture, and with how much Sweat and Labor these are scarce solv'd at last; whereas the others are answered, so that nothing like Evidence can be brought against them, especially, if Men would come to look upon these Objections, as upon so many weak difficulties of Human Reason against an Authority, which so strongly can prove her participation of Divine Verity, having for the Evidence thereof twelve strong Texts of Scripture related *Seet. 14, 15*. So many invincible Reasons related *Seet. 16*. So many unanswerable Testimonies of Holy Fathers as have been related these four last Sections. He (I say) who would thus on both sides consider the matter, would find it even impossible for him in his Conscience to deny, that the Objections against the Infallibility of the Church are anywise either so many in number, or so insuperable to Human Capacity, as the Objections be which may be made against the Infallibility of Scripture.

2. And because this Observation and Note is of great moment to make the Protestant Reader see, that it is more his own prejudice against the Churches Infallibility, which stands in his light, than any solid Reason; I will alledge an Objection or two, which poor, weak human Reason moves against the Divine Infallibility of all that is contain'd in undoubted Scripture. We need not go far to find these Objections. Even in the first Chapter of the first Gospel I find a difficulty so great, that tho' I have (as I fully think) most carefully sought satisfaction concerning it, in thirty or more of the best Interpreters, yet I could find no Answer half so satisfactory, as I, with my poor ability, hope to give to the very strongest Objection that I could ever yet see made against the Infallibility of the Church, taking the Church in the Sense which I explicated *Seet. 18.* The Objection is this, which you may touch with your Fingers. It is said, *Matt. 1. v. 17.* *All the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations, and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations.* This is the infallible Text. Now take your Fingers, and count with as great Infallibility, as you can

can count fourteen names set down in fair Print before your Eyes. In the first fourteen you will find *Abraham* to be the first, and *David* to be the last. These you must not count over again in the second fourteen. So that *Solomon* is the first of the second fourteen, and *Jechonias* is the last: And as *David* was not to be counted in the second fourteen, because he was already counted in the first; so also *Jechonias* must not be counted once more in the third fourteen, because he has been once before counted in the second fourteen; whence it follows, that the first in the third fourteen is *Salathiel* the Son of *Jechonias*, and the last must needs be *Christ* himself; so that you must find twelve more Generations between *Salathiel* the first and *Christ* the last; or else (says Human Reason) infallibly you have not fourteen Generations as *St. Matthew* saith you have. It is a small labor for you to see whether you have twelve more, or no? Lay every several finger upon every several Name, and if you have ten Fingers two Names must remain untouch'd, or else you will not have twelve. I touch'd my Thumb upon the Name of *Salathiel*, whom I have prov'd to be the first of the last fourteen, then I touch'd the Name of *Zorobabel* with my Fore-finger, and thus

thus having touch'd all my ten Fingers at the ten following Names, I could not possibly see any more Names to touch but the Name of *Joseph*. When Reason told me, that seem'd to the very Eye to be a demonstration that *Salathiel*, who was the first of this last fourteen, having but eleven more following him to *Christ*, could not (with *Christ*) make up the last fourteen. How then, if this be infallibly true, comes that also to be infallibly true which *St. Matthew* says contrary to this, calling these last thirteen Generations as clearly fourteen as he call'd the former?

3. Again *St. Luke* setting down the Genealogy of *Christ*, says, *cap. 3. v. 35, 36. Salah which was the Son of Cainan, which (Cainan) was the Son of Arphaxad.* And all the Greek Copies of the *New Testament* read thus, conformable to all the Greek Copies of the *Old Testament*, *Gen. 11. v. 12.* Yet if you turn to this place in *Genesis* translated faithfully by our vulgar, and your own Bible, you shall not find that *Cainan* was the Son of *Arphaxad*, as *St. Luke* says, but you shall find these words; *And Arphaxad lived five and thirty years and begat Salah*, whereas this *Salah* was the Son of *Cainan* according to *St. Luke* and not the Son of *Arphaxad*. If you say this *Salah* was *Arphaxad's*

phaxad's Son, because *Arphaxad* was his Grand-father; I pray note, that *Arphaxad* is said to have begot him when he was *five and thirty years old*, whereas if you mark even that Chapter of *Genesis*, you shall see no one there mention'd who had a Son before thirty years old; for as in those days they liv'd very long, so it was long before they us'd then to marry. Again there is yet a far greater difficulty that the Greek Copy of the *Old Testament*, which *St. Luke* follow'd, reads thus, *And Arphaxad lived five and thirty years and begat Cainan*, so that, if *Arphaxad* were Grandfather to *Salab* because he begat his Father *Cainan*, when he himself was *five and thirty years old* (in which year of his Age your Bible and ours say he begat *Salab*) thus *Salab* his Grandchild and *Cainan* his Father must be born the same year, which, says Reason, is infallibly false. Now if you say *Cainan* is to be omitted according to some Greek Copies in the *Old Testament*, yet what will you say to all the Copies of the *New Testament* which most unanimously put him down? Here venerable *Bede* professeth himself to admire that which his dulness cannot understand. And indeed, I think no Man understands it. And Reason is more gravelled and quite non-pluss'd at another contradiction, which seems

seems to her unavoidable. Turn in your Bible to *Kings 2. cap. 8. v. 26.* There you read, *Two and twenty years old was Ahasia when he began to reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem, and his Mothers name was Athaliath.* Now turn to *2 Chron. cap. 22. v. 2.* and see if a very different story be not also true Scripture. For thus you shall read, *Forty and two years old was Ahasia when he began to reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem, his Mothers name was Athaliath.* Against the Infallibility then of Scripture, Reason conceives her self to have this infallible demonstration: No one is infallible in speech who speaks two things quite contrary one to another; but these two speeches are quite contrary, when of the same Man one affirms, *He began to reign when he was two and twenty year old,* and another affirms, *that he was forty two years old;* therefore the Scripture is not infallible in speech.

4. Here by the way reflect (dear Reader) how demonstratively false it is which our Adversaries say, that by the only knowledge of Scripture a Man may clearly be instructed in all fundamental or necessary Points: Now I ask, Whether any Point be with you more fundamental or more necessary than this; *The Scripture is infallible?* But this Point is so far from being clearly deduc'd out of

the reading of the Scripture, that he, who shall read these three places, shall see with his Eyes, that these places alone make this verity more obscure than any place of Scripture makes the contrary evident; for Reason left to her self, will sooner shift off any place you can cite for the evidence of the Scriptures *Infallibility*, than you shall be able to shift off the places cited. I do not put the Answer to those three places, that the Reader may, by his own experience, see how true it is, that all that concerns necessary Points is not clear in Scripture; for what Point more necessary, than that the Scripture is infallible, and what Point has such unanswerable difficulty as these be? If you could but bring half so clear a demonstration against the *Infallibility* of the Church, how would you triumph? All that could be said by us would never satisfy you. And yet here you must be satisfied, or grant Scripture in it self not to be infallible. What Fondness then, for incomparable weaker Objections, to stand out so perniciously against the *Infallibility* of the Church. Note this, and you will soon note your own preposterous dealing.

5. Secondly, I must set down here a note, which, according to good method, some might have expected in the beginning of this Question of *Infallibility*;

libility; but had it been put down there, it might have been subject to have been forgotten before we should have come to make chief use of it, which is to be done in this next Section. This second note then, is this, That my Reader must be made capable of what kind of Infallibility we speak, when we say, *The Church in her Traditions, and Definitions, is infallible*; for that these Traditions and Definitions deliver infallible Verities unto us. This Point is learnedly declar'd by our learned Country-man, *Bacon in analysi fidei, Disp. 3. cap. 7.* citing divers solid Divines for this Doctrin. We say then, that our Act of Faith, by which we believe the Church, proposing any thing to us by her Traditions or Definitions, is infallible in this sense; that this Act of Faith is begot by such causes as do secure it from all kind of Error; so that the Understanding, which is inform'd, or made knowing by this Act, ought to adhere so strongly to what such an Act affirms to be true, that tho' an Angel from Heaven should say the contrary, this Understanding would never be brought to assent to him. So firm adhesion flows from an Act secur'd so well from Error by the causes which did produce it, I say with great reflection that this Understanding

by this Act is so affected, that the party would not be brought by the Preaching of an Angel to believe the contrary, and I did not say, that *it could not be brought*. For tho' the nature of evident knowledge shewing that a thing is so, makes that the party *cannot assent to the contrary*; yet this infallible Act of Faith, only makes a Man so affected that *he will not cease from adhering* so strongly to what he believes, as long as this Act remains unretracted. This firmness of Adhesion springs from the great value and esteem which we put (deservedly) upon the Causes moving him to this Assent. And this is the true reason why you will by no means be brought to doubt of the Infallibility of the Scripture by any strong Objection that your natural Reason makes, when she suggests such Objections as I just now fram'd mear pertinaciousness also, and a false fancy of the value of the Causes by which even Heretics pretend to be mov'd to their Errors, makes many rather lose their lives, than forsake to stick close to what they imagin to be Gods Word; shall not then a prudent esteem, solidly grounded concerning the Divine Authority moving to the belief of these and these Points, be able to make a Man adhere so closely to them as I said?

When

When then my Understanding has motives, tho' not wholly infallible, yet such as cause a most prudent Assent *that God has said such a thing*; and this is made so evidently credible unto me, that in prudence I cannot think it to be otherwise, and Heaven is also by most highly valuable promises, offer'd me, if I will assent to this with that respect which is due to Gods Word; and Hell on the contrary is threatned unto me by most truly formidable Menaces, if I will not assent to this Verity as to a Verity affirm'd by God; am I not rather stark mad, than imprudent only if I will not bend my Understanding by force of my Will to adhere with all its power, to this Verity, as to a Verity affirm'd by God, and esteem it as such a Verity ought to be esteem'd. Wherefore, as it is a blasphemous impiety to suspect, that the very least danger of falsity can be in a thing affirm'd by God; so, because the reasons I alledg'd make me carry my self so towards that (which is thus propos'd to me to believe) as towards a Verity reveal'd by God, the self same Reasons do make me consequently more willing to deny any natural Evidence; that I can have, than to give way to the entertainment of any suspicion of Fallibility in this which I have receiv'd as Gods own

Word, as indeed it is. See *Sect. 16. num. 6.*

6. Now that which I mainly insist upon, is this, Such an Infallibility of adhesion as this Act is, cannot be liable, or any way subject to uncertainty, no more than the Infallibility of that Man whom God had fully resolv'd so to guide, and direct, in all that he should say or write, that he would never permit him to say or write the least falsity, altho' this Man never knew nor suspected himself to have this privilege. Just so, tho' we neither feel, nor by evidence know the Infallibility of our Assent, our Act of Assent will be infallible, if God really concurs unto it by such principles as are no way liable to Error. All the difficulty then in proving this our Assent to be infallible, consists in this, Whether or no we can prove that God concurs to this Assent by such Principles as are no way liable to Error? To prove this, we must prove, that our Assent has for its Object not only an apparent Revelation, but also a Revelation certainly true; and not only true casually (by our hitting by chance upon such an Object as is truly reveal'd by God) but it must be of such a nature that it cannot, in these circumstances guide me to assent to any thing but that which cannot but be truly reveal'd. This then I prove thus, Altho' there

there might be imagin'd such circumstances in which God could let me have all the motives which so powerfully move to believe, that such and such a Point is to be reveal'd by God; altho' this were not so; yet supposing that the Divine Providence has resolv'd never to permit (in the circumstances in which Men now live) any Falsity to be commended to our Belief by so powerful motives as these be, to-wit, Miracles, full report of Millions, and Millions reaching uniformly the same Points to have been deliver'd down to them, by Millions attesting, that they receiv'd them as deliver'd from the Apostles, and thus going up until we come to them who testify, that with their own Ears they heard all these Points deliver'd by them, and did see them work Worlds of Miracles in confirmation of them, that they did hear those simple Men refute all Philosophers, speak all Languages, tell the very secrets of the Heart, foretel things to come without ever missing, &c. Supposing, I say, that the Divine Providence is resolv'd never to let any Falsity cloak her self with these powerful motives, these motives are the certain Liveries of Truth, and that which comes vested in them, cannot be any thing but Truth. And this holds good whether I be or be not as-

fur'd, that the Divine Providence is resolv'd never to permit any Falsity to be thus recommended to us. For it is not our knowing that no Falsity will ever be permitted by God to be thus recommended to us, which is the cause why no Falsity can be thus recommended; but it is nearly the extrinsical Will of God, determining to provide so for our sure guidance to that end, for which he created us, that hence he comes to resolve not to permit at any time, any Falsity to be so powerfully recommended unto us as it should be by these Motives of Credibility which he sets apart for his peculiar use of delivering the Verities of our Faith unto us, as we set the use of our Seals apart for ratifying only such things as we intend to acknowledge for our own true Deeds.

7. If you ask of me, how I can prove that God has resolv'd never to permit any Falsity to be recommended by those Motives, by which the Verities of our Faith are recommended? I answer, That first, the Motives which recommended the Verities of our Faith, do convince that which is so recommended, to be morally certain; as the full report of all Men from all parts of *England* make it morally certain

certain that there is such a City as *London*, to those who never came near *London* by an hundred Miles. How much then would it misbecome the Divine Verity and Goodness to concur to the making of a Falsity so credible as it is credible to all Men that there is such a City as *London*? But Secondly, It would far more misbecome him to make no less assured offers of Heaven to those who would believe a Lie thus recommended, and threaten Hell unto them without they would embrace such a lie, even for a Verity reveal'd by God; which Threats were as certainly to be fear'd, as *London* is certainly to be believ'd to be in *England* by those who have not seen *London*. Thirdly, It is evident that God can impose an Obligation upon Man to follow the true Religion as a means necessary to obtain his Salvation, which Religion may propose some Verities to be believ'd as Divine; and as things reveal'd by God: Now supposing our nature and present condition, (I may boldly say) either that Belief which is recommended by such motives as ours are, must be this true Religion, or you cannot assign unto me any other kind of Belief, recommended by any other kind of motives, which can make it seem so credible to me as our Religion. It is im-

possible that a mere Lie should be so much more credible than Gods true Word, as our Religion is absolutely more credible than any false Belief; for this would breed a notable disparagement and disesteem of the Divine Authority, making it of less credit than a Lie. How can that God, who has a serious Will to oblige us to Embrace that Belief as Divine, which is the only true way appointed by him to lead us to Heaven, have a Will also directly destructive of this Will? that is, How can he have a Will to permit the Lies, opposite to what he would have us believe, to be in all reason made more credible by the motives which recommend them, than those Verities are, which according to Reason he would have us embrace, not only for Verities, but for Verities affirm'd by him, that is, for infallible Verities? So that you see at last, we have brought it to a plain contradiction to say, that (supposing our nature and the present circumstances appointed *de facto*, by the Divine Providence) our Religion recommended by the aforesaid motives should be false in this present state, whatsoever it might have been in some other state, which God could have chosen, if he would have had no Providence concerning us; to which Providence I confess nothing could oblige him.

8. Supposing then no more than what is evident both by Scripture and Reason, that God is resolv'd to have a Providence over us, and to bring us to the end for which he made us, by the Belief of several Verities which he has reveal'd; it is impossible that as long as he has this Will, he should not also have a Will to recommend to our belief these Verities (which he would have us believe) by such motives, as no Lie can come recommended by him as long as he still intends to use this Providence towards us. The Acts then of our Faith are infallible, because really (whether the party who believes, knows it or no) these Acts proceed from such causes as are incapable (in these present circumstances) of recommending any thing that is false: But they still recommend that which is attested not by any apparent, but by a most true Revelation made by *Christ's* Apostles to the Church; which Church also is, by the like motives recommended, as infallible, and we evidently, by our very Senses, know what this Church certainly teacheth; whereas, tho' all which the Scripture says be infallible, yet we have not only no Infallibility, but even no very probable Certainty of our understanding the Scripture in the true sense in many necessary Points,,

Points, except it be by the instruction of the Church, as has fully been shewed *Sett.* 7.

9. Now besides these exterior Principles of our assent, by which I say we believe with an infallible Belief the Articles of our Faith, we must here note that the assent it self is never produced (even by those who have the Habit of true Faith) unless it be by the supernatural illumination of God, elevating us to all that has immediate relation to the supernatural state of Heavenly Glory; whence St. Paul teacheth us that in order to attain this high state *we are not sufficient of our selves to think any thing as of our selves, but our sufficiency is from God, 2 Cor. 3. 5.* Every time that a true Believer exerciseth an Act of true Faith, God of his infinite goodness, affords this supernatural light infusing it unto the Understanding to elevate it; and inable it, to produce the supernatural Act of Faith. Yet when a Man has, or has not this supernatural assistance in his Act, he cannot tell, be he never so learned. This all may know, that God do's never give this supernatural help to believe any thing, which is not really deliver'd by a true Revelation made to the Apostles; otherwise he might be said to give supernatural aid to believe a Lie.

10. Out of all this Discourse, that appears to be true, which we most desire to be noted, That our Acts of Faith may be most truly infallible and are proved to be so, because they proceed from Causes so determining to that only which is true, that they cannot determin our assent to any Falsity; and that all this happens thus, altho' we cannot evidently know when we believe infallibly.

Sect. 24.

Twenty Objections of an University Man against the Infallibility of the Church, and also some others are solved.

1. **A**fter I had resolv'd on this Treatise, I did read in the Preface of an University Man to a work of *John Daille*, set forth to excuse the reformed Churches from Schisms, Twenty Objections urged with so great confidence against the Infallibility of the Church that at the end of his Preface he promiseth to turn Papist if such Objections be punctually Answer'd; but withal he would have yet one argument more solved. I shall endeavor to give him a little more large satisfaction than he requires; For I will also return him Answer to all that concerns this Point, either in this or any other part of his Preface.

2. First

2. First then *P. 22.* He would overthrow all we have said of the Churches being our Judge in Controversies, because so little is said against Heretics, for denying this, by *St. Epiphanius* and *St. Austin*, to which I have abundantly Answer'd, *Sect. 2.* And also he would have us condemn'd by the silence of *Tertullian*, which I have Answer'd, *Sect. 20. N. 9. fine*; and by the like silence of *Vincent Lirinensis*, which I have Answer'd, *Sect. 7.* What you add of *Optatus* and *St. Austin*, who found against their Adversaries no Judge upon Earth (as you say) but Scripture; you must note that they spoke as they did, not because the Faithful People were not provided of another infallible Judge, but because those contentious Fellows against whom they spoke did (as *Optatus* intimates) make no account of the Churches contrary Judgment, as the Jews make no account of our new Testament: Wherefore, as when Doctors or Fathers dispute against Jews, they do not stand pressing them with the Authority of the New Testament, tho' they themselves hold it of infallible Authority (because they know the Jews scoff at such Authorities) so *St. Austin* here, and formerly cited by you, as also *Optatus*, did not stand pressing their Adversaries with the Authority of the Church, which they themselves

selves held infallible, because they knew those Heretics would as much scoff at them as the Jews would scoff at those who should press the Authority of the New Testament, and as you use to scoff at us if we only cite the Council of *Trent* against you. Wherefore you see that I, who so clearly hold the Church our infallible Judge, do not take any Text of the Council of *Trent* for my Argument to prove this, tho' I hold that Council infallible.

3. Again you Object St. *Paul's* making no mention of this Judge in his Epistle to the *Romans*; in which I am sure he do's not also tell them that the Scripture only must be taken for Judge; nor do's he warn them to take great heed of the Bishops of that City, who in time would Usurp a Judicative Authority which should be the bane of Christendom, as Dr. *Fern* speaks, and make all their Errors incurable, as you both speak, *which news would have been worth all the rest of his Epistle*, in the Judgment of those who pass their Judgment with that prophane Liberty that you do here. The Truth is, that this Judgment-Seat concern'd no more the *Romans*, than all the World. St. *Paul* twice taught the Infallibility of the Church to all the World in the Texts I cited, *Seet. 15. N. 14. N. 18.* That then, which no more concern'd the *Romans* than

than all the World, was not in reason to be intimated to them in particular. What you add next of the deep silence of the Fathers and Historians about this Point, must needs turn to confound your ignorance when you shall have read all I said, *Seet. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22.* Your ensuing discourse (for as much as concerns our Doctrin of Infallibility) has had its full Answer in my last Section, by which you will see that when any thing is believ'd, which is not truly reveal'd, the Act of Faith can never be infallible, and so no Act of Faith concerning Protestantism can be infallible. Neither are we infallible because the Acts of our Faith are infallible, no more than all those who believ'd *Christ* himself or his Apostles were infallible. They are indeed infallibly guided, but if they leave off being thus guided, and will become guides, they will soon bewray their own Fallibility. What next concerns Infallibility, be your Twenty Objections put by way of Questions, as some of them indeed are.

4. *Objection 1.* You ask whether there be any infallible Judge upon Earth! I have given you a full Answer, *Quest. 1.*

5. *Ob. 2.* Whether the Church be that Judge? and why not rather some of those Ten things named by *Chilling.* I have *Quest. 3. initio,* given reasons sufficient for any

any reasonable Man, who must not think that in this our last Age, he is Born soon enough by a Thousand and six hundred Years, to teach the Church that which no one Parish of the Church can ever be proved to have held. The very citing Scripture for ten several Judges (as you say *Chilling.* do's) shew clearly how infinitely short of solid Proof all other Judges Commissions fall, in comparison of what we have alledged for the Churches Authority in this Point, through the whole third Question.

6. *Ob.* 3. Whether the *Roman* Church be this Judge? Yes. See all my Proofs from *Sect.* 17, to my last Section.

7. *Ob.* 4. Whether the Infallibility of this Church, be in the Head (the Pope) or in the Body; and whether in the Body diffusive or collective? All this I have Answer'd, *Sect.* 18. N. 1. 2, 3. For as much as concerns the Practical Duty of any Catholic School Speculations (or Divines private Opinions) have nothing to do with necessary Faith.

8. *Ob.* 5. Here your Questions turn to Objections, which contain in general, the difficulties concerning those Persons who ought to have their free Votes in a Council. Concerning this Point, I have said something *Sect.* 18. N. 3. By which the Laics and inferior Clergy are sufficiently

ciently excluded, tho' these Clergy mens Votes as Consultive, or for Advice sake, be most laudably demanded, when they be Eminent Divines: And for the comfort of the weaker, their Subscriptions may be of very good use and service to overwhelm Heretics, by such Authority as they use to fear most, who slight any mention of more than Human Authority in Councils. And because amongst all these inferior Clergy men, you think the *Chor-episcopi* to be most regarded; I will easily satisfy you concerning their small Right to pass a decisive Voice in General Councils: If you have either the Councils, or the Sum of them by *Carranza*, you shall find in the Decrees of Pope *Damasus*, as Ancient as he is, how being asked (*Epist. 4.*) Whether the *Chor-episcopi* were any thing in the Church of God or nothing? and what Authority they had in the Church? and he Answers, That they were nothing in the Church of God, in which they had no Authority, and that their institution was wicked, and too too bad, and contrary to the Sacred Canons, and the Peace of the whole Church. And therefore, he defined that all was vain and void, that they had done in the Episcopal Function. And that for those Causes, they were forbidden both by the Sacred Seat (of Rome) and by all the Bishops of the World. It follows, How that in the Primitive Church,

Church, these Chor-Episcopi did seem necessary for the peculiar care they had over the poor, and tho' by Ordination, they were only Priests, they presumed at last to Exercise many things belonging to Bishops, to Consecrate Sub-deacons, and Deacons, &c. But their Ambition was soon curbed by the Church; And Bishops were severely forbidden to lay any part of their Episcopal Function upon them. I say then, that only Bishops have Right in a General Council. For of these Prelates only it was said, *He that will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Publican or Heathen.* To them only it was said, *Go and teach all Nations, and Lo I am with you until the end of the World.* To them all those special Promises of Divine Assistance were made, which I urged Sect. 15. N. 17. None of these are directed to Laics, or inferior Clergy men, who succeeded the Disciples and not the Apostles.

9. Ob. 6. Whether these Bishops Assembled (with their Head and chief Pastor) be so absolutely infallible, that they cannot determin falsely in Point of Faith, let them do what they will? I answer, That as I shewed Sect. 19. N. 1. 2. they are to regulate themselves according to Scripture and Tradition, discussing carefully what has been reveal'd to the Church by these means, concerning the Points which they treat of. See the place I cited,

cited, and you will see how notoriously manifest their Proceedings must needs be; but they must be the Judges, and not we, that they have done their Duty in regulating themselves according to those two infallible Rules; yet we are secur'd that they have done their Duty, both by the notorious publicity of the Fact, and by their Subscriptions to the legal carriage of all that essentially concerns the Being of a true Council, and also by seeing no considerable part of the Church diffused, refuse their Decrees. Fear not you to do, what you see all the Church do, with so Universal a Consent: Neither will I press you to consent, until you first see this General Consent go before you. Were there any notorious neglect of legal Proceeding to the introducing of Error; the whole Church representative and diffusive, would never be permitted by God, to submit cheerfully thereunto. I might ask, how shall I know the Scripture Writers, did their Duty in obeying Divine Inspiration? If they did not, Adieu all Faith.

10. *Ob.* 7. How shall I know when they determin aright? What is requir'd to a Synodical Constitution? Must all concur in the Vote, or will the major part serve the turn? I answer, you shall know all these things to have been done as they should be, by seeing that all have
 subscribed.

subscrib'd to the Council as proceeding legally in her Constitutions, which also you may stay 'to see accepted by the Church for lawful Decrees. When you see this done, without any considerable contradiction, I hope you will think you may prudently submit, and cannot but imprudently stand out any longer. And for you particular, we will condescend to you to stand out so long. When you are to be so leading a man of whole Provinces, that your submission would be requir'd before any of theirs, it will be a longer work to tell you all belonging to your Duty. What belongs to you at present, I have told you in order to Practice. The constant Practice of the Church, has sufficiently inform'd the leading-men Governors of the Church, how they are to proceed in doing that which so many Ages have practis'd before them.

11. *Ob.* 8. What makes a General Council; must all the Bishops of the VWorld be called? I answer, That makes a General Council, which has ever since the Primitive Church, served to make all the General Councils which have been made. Look on the first Council in the Apostles time, and you will find not all the Apostles, but only *Peter, James, John, Paul*, and *Barnaby* present. See *Baron. An.* 51. And yet their Decrees sent to all Churches,

Churches, did bear this Preface, *It has seemed good to the Holy Ghost and us.* In the four first Councils (which your *English* Church admits) the fourth part of the Bishops was never present, and in the Councils kept in the *East*, few Bishops appear'd from the *West*, and to the Councils kept in the *West*, few Bishops came commonly from the *East*. The Practice of the Church (the best Interpreter of Divine Laws) teacheth, that it sufficeth that all who can conveniently be called and summon'd, do appear, and that such a competent number appear and set in Council, as those (who are Assembled together with their Head) judge sufficient on the one side; and on the other side, that those who be not present, knowing well enough (as we see by Experience of the appearance made in Parliament, how all men know how great or little it is) those I say, knowing how great or little the appearance of Bishops is in the Council, say nothing against it, but silently consent to permit them to Proceed as a sufficient Representative of the Church, and accordingly admit of their Decrees when they are made.

12. Ob. 9. Whether it be a lawful Council if all come not who are called: I have made my Answer already, That it is sufficient that a sufficient number comes, that

that is, a number approved for sufficient by the Church, in the manner I now expressed.

13. Ob. 10. VVho must call the General Council? The Pope, or Christian Kings and Emperors? And how shall I be assured which of them must? I answer, that it is evident out of Scripture, that there is no Divine Institution, by which either Emperors or Kings be assur'd to be still found in the VVorld; or that (when they have that Dignity) they be by Divine Institution, invested with a Power to call Councils. VVe seek for this Divine Institution: This we will not admit, until it can be shewed in Scripture or Tradition. The Fact of Calling, shews not Divine Institution. Secondly, As for the Prelates of the Church, we can shew Divine Institution, *Act. 20. 28. Bishops placed by the Holy Ghost over all the Flock, to feed or govern the Church of God.* And *4. Epheſ.* Not Lay Magistrates, but only Ecclesiastical, are said to be *be given us by Christ for the Work of the Ministry, for the Edifying the Body of Christ, that hence forth we may not be caried about with every wind of Doctrin, &c.* Thirdly, the Emperor is not by Divine Institution Lord of the Christian VVorld, no, nor of any considerable part of it; wherefore, seeing that a motive Power, is no motive Power any further

further than it can or ought to be able to move, the Imperial Power, which neither can nor ought to move further than it Reigns, cannot consequently command any further than his Territory at the uttermost. The Power of the chief Pastor of the Universal Church, is co-extended to the Universal Church. All Bishops of the Universal Church being to be moved, must be moved by such a Power as this is. If Emperors called Councils, it was not by any Ecclesiastical Calling (such an one as the Pope called them by at the very self same time) but the Emperors Calling was only Political, proceeding from a Temporal Power, subserving to the Ecclesiastical, and not able to force them by Censure, in case of refusing to come, as the Ecclesiastical Power could, which Power implored the Imperial assistance to concur with her, only for the more effectual Execution. Perhaps sometimes Emperors might venture to call dependently of the ratification of the Supreme Pastor, which they presum'd, would be easily obtain'd in to just necessities, as then seem'd to press for a speedy Remedy. If Emperors or Kings were present in Council, it was only by their Presence and good Countenance to honor, encourage and further the Proceedings of the Council, and not to pass their Vote in Points of Belief. 14. Ob.

✓

14. *Ob.* 11. How far are the Councils Determinations infallible? Whether in Matters of Fact as well as Faith? I Answer, That they are infallible only in Matters of Faith. Matters of Fact have no ground for their having been done so, or not done so, either in Scripture or Tradition; Wherefore concerning Matters of Fact, the Church Rules her self by no former Revelation, and she pretends to no new Revelations, but only to declare clearly what she finds to have before been reveal'd. The Infallibility was thus promised to the Church, *He shall teach you all things, and suggest all things whatsoever I shall say unto you.* Things of Fact are said and testified only by men, therefore not Objects of Faith.

15. *Ob.* 12. Whether in these Matters of Faith, the Church be infallible in Fundamentals only? I Answer, That in all the Authorities which I cited for the Infallibility of the Church out of Scripture, *Seet.* 14. N. 3. &c. and 15. I shew'd that they are groundlessly restrain'd to only Fundamentals in the Sense you mean. The same was proved by my Reasons, *Seet.* 16.

16. *Ob.* 13. How shall I infallibly know what Points are Fundamental, what not? I Answer, This Question may pose those who will be restraining

the general Promises of infallible Assistance made to the Church, to Fundamental Points only; that is, unto they themselves, know not what. But to us Catholics, all is Fundamental, which is made appear, to be propos'd to us by the Church as a Verity reveal'd by God, whether it be in a Matter more or less importing of its own Nature.

17. Ob. 14. How shall I know in time of Schism, when there be two Popes or more, which of these is *S. Petres* true Successor? I Answer, That this Question, as explicated by you, is put very unskillfully. For you pass from Arguing against the Infallibility of a Pope, as defining with a Council, to argue against those Divines who deliver not the Churches Belief, but their private Opinion to be, that the Pope should be held infallible out of a Council; concerning which Opinion, I have shewed it already to be impertinent to our purpose. Your Objection against us should be put thus, The Church (with us) is held to be the Pope defining with a Council: But in time of Schisms, where there be more pretended Popes, we do not assuredly know that he who defines with the Council, is the true Pope, or Successor of *S. Peter*. And then I Answer thus, If before the calling and meeting of the Council, there be more than

than one pretending to be Popes, that he shall ever be esteem'd the right Pope, to whom the Prelates of the Church shall unanimously obey when he calls them to meet in a General Council, and in this Council to preside over them. To have two such Popes (as these are) at one time, is impossible. And this is the only time in which a Pope defines with a lawful Council. What you say of Popes not defining in such a Council, is not our Case. Put me a Pope defining with a lawful Council, and then prove him fallible if you can. Whether the Popes Definitions out of a Council be fallible or infallible, makes nothing to this purpose. Only this is evident, if they be infallible out of a Council, they be infallible in a Council in all Opinions. I add with *Bellarmin, Lib. 2. de Conciliis, Cap. 19.* That altho a Council without a Pope cannot define any Article of Faith, yet in time of Schism, it can judge which is true Pope, and provide the Church of a true Pastor, if she had none; who thus provided by the Councils Authority, may dissolve the Council if he pleaseth; or if he please to have them remain assembled, they remain so now by his Authority, and can define as well as other Councils call'd by the Pope. In that meeting in which the Pope

was to be chosen, or declar'd the undoubted Pope, the Prelates of the Church might and ought to meet upon their own Authority and assemble themselves.

18. *Ob.* 15. Suppose all agree on the Pope, and a General Council meet, how shall I be sure that he, who is accounted Pope, is so indeed; for Simonie makes him none; and that he was not Simoniacal is impossible for me to know? And then you labour to prove, that *Sixtus Quintus* was notoriously Simoniacal, which makes nothing to our purpose: Neither follows it from hence, that those, who being made Cardinals by him, came afterwards to be Popes, were no true Popes. For you are too ignorant to treat of these matters, if you know not that a Man may be a true Pope, who never was a Cardinal. To that which is pertinent, I answer, that tho' he, whose Election to the Popedom is Simoniacal, may be depos'd, as having obtain'd that dignity unlawfully, yet, as all Jurists say, *The Crown once obtain'd supplies all defects*; so I may far better say, that this defect being only against Ecclesiastical Laws, may be supplied so, that of an illegal Pope, he may be afterward made a lawful one. For in the Church Diffusive there is power to have this Man Pope if they will; and that they will they testify when

when they obey his Summons, calling all Bishops to a Council, and permitting him, as their Head, to preside, and as supreme Pastor to define in the Council. Lastly, By the Churches admission of the Council I know the Council, and consequently, the Pope was as legal as is necessary.

19. Ob. 16. How shall I know that those Bishops, who with the Pope make up the Council be Bishops indeed. For no Bishops, no Council. Now if he, who ordain'd them, when he gave Orders did not intend to give them those Orders (and whether he did or no God only knows) then they be no Bishops. I answer, That if they be Bishops I am bound to admit their Decrees, and as he should sin damnably, who would not honor such a Man, held by all Men to be his true Father, because it is impossible for him to know that his Mother did not lie when she said so, or to know whether it be not the Devil in his Fathers shape, so I should sin damnably in not acknowledging by due Obedience these to be true Fathers of Gods People, who are esteem'd so by all the World upon far better ground than such a Man is esteem'd your Father. For first, those who ordain Bishops or Priests be for the most part Men most eminent in the Church. How is it

510. *The Roman Church is*

then morally possible, that many such Men should just happen, in so many several places of the World, just to be the Ordainers of just such Bishops, as should be in the Church just at that time, (which commonly is not above once in a hundred years) when a Council is call'd? Again, there are more than three Thousand Bishops at a time in the Church (as witnesseth *Alb. Ros. Rubric. ff. de statu omnium*) out of which number we see that it is very rare for more than three hundred to be assembled at a Council, which is but every tenth Bishop; now morally impossible is it that just every tenth Bishop should happen just to be that Bishop who go's to the Council from this part of the World (where in an Age no one Bishop was ever heard of to be thus invalidly ordain'd) and that just at the same time there should come from another part of the World (where such an abominable Ordination is as unheard of as in this part) another Bishop, whose ill chance it was to be thus ordain'd. And thus from a third, fourth, fifth, sixth part of the World, just such Bishops should come in a number sufficient to make the number of other true Bishops unsufficient for a true Council. Surely this is a thing far more morally impossible, than that the Common-wealth of *England* should
ever

ever happen to have a full Parliament of Knights and Burgeſſes freely choſen, to the number of three hundred, who ſhould not only be all of them Baſtards; but alſo all of them call'd *John*. This I prove evidently; becauſe to confer holy Orders, or Baptize without a due intention, is not only a Sin moſt abominable and damnable, but it is ſuch a Sin as brings with it neither pleaſure nor profit, nor any thing which may the leaſt intice any ordinary Man, much leſs Biſhops and Prieſts to commit a Sin ſo hideous, and ſo unprofitable; wherefore from *Chriſts* time to this I do not think that the moſt knowing Man upon Earth do's know to produce fix examples of the committing of this Sin. But on the other ſide, no Man knows ſo little, but he has knowledge enough to tell him, without any raſh judgment, that it is an ordinary thing in every County and City of *England* to find divers known Baſtards, and that the number of the unknown is ten times as great. And again, The name of *John* is the moſt common of all names; wherefore conſidering the nature of things, it is far from all impoſſibility that many of theſe Baſtards ſhould be call'd by this name. And their Baſtardiſm not being known, the election may fall upon them

in this County; and what happens in this County may happen in another, and so in all at once. Weaker far than this is your Argument, and yet, how secure would all Men think *England* from all misery, if we were all fully assur'd that no misery should fall upon this Nation until we did chance to have a free Parliament, consisting of three hundred Men, of which every one should be a Bastard and every one call'd *John*? It is great want of solidity in Judgment in so many sharp-witted Men, to esteem so much such a weak Argument. And this is true prescinding from all special Providence of Almighty God over his Church; but the least thought of that Providence makes this light Objection vanish into Smoke, and together with it the next Objection. For how easily could God put it efficaciously in the minds of true Bishops to meet in a sufficient number; and when I see the Church Universal admit such a Council to be a true one, I hence know that it had a sufficient number of true Bishops.

30. *Ob.* 17. How shall I know that the Pope and Bishops assembled are Christians, &c. Here you discourse just as before, and the same Answer answers you to the full. Yet for a further Answer to both, I will shew how wise your Argument is, by framing just another like to it thus.

thus. O Christians! how do you infallibly know that in these Sixteen Ages since the Age of writing the Bible, the Devil in some one Age did not intice as many Men as were sufficient to corrupt the Bible, for I cannot see but that the Devil might easily make so many promises far more inticing than any ordinary motive which should move Men to Baptize a Child in a false form, or with want of due intention? With such Promises then the Devil might intice those who did write out the Bible, to write false, just in such and such places as he should suggest to them, so that in the space of a few Ages, the multitude of the false Copies made them pass for the only true ones; and how know we infallibly, that this might not have been done much after that Age in which the Devil incited the Tyrants to force all Christians to give up their Bibles to be burnt, by which means the true Copies growing scarce, false ones might possibly be brought into common use by the malice of the Devil, as has been said? And this Example defeats also your next Objection. Do's the Divine Providence sleep in this manner?

21. Ob. 18. How shall we know certainly that these are the Determinations of the Council? False Canons may be foisted in, and false Copies

may be vented. I answer, That what has, or has not been decreed by a Council, may as well, and far better be known certainly, than what has been decreed by one of our Parliaments; for Councils are so much more notified to all, because they are the Parliaments not of one, but of all Catholic Nations, and so their Deeds are more public. Now how intolerable a Caveller were he in a Commonwealth, who should plead the not obliging of Parliamentary Decrees, by reason of the impossibility to know for certain what was decreed, and which were the true Copies of the true Decrees? You would perswade us, that we cannot be sure of that of which we see by daily experience we may be made as sure as we would wish. The Decrees of Councils are publicly read, in the Council publicly Subscrib'd and Seal'd by the Council. The Original of these Subscriptions carefully preserv'd, the Copies first set forth before divers Witnesses are conferr'd with the Original with a public Testimony (as you may see at the end of any Bull) *that it agrees with the Original.* Those, who in great number were present at the making of the Decrees do own them; no one in the Church disclaims from them, and in case any should, satisfaction would presently be given.

Our

Our very Adversaries write against us for Decreeing such and such things; the fact is never deny'd, but ever defended. If in any Press, a false Copie should be set forth, you will have Prohibition after Prohibition, and penalty added to penalty, until those Copies be suppress'd; and all Books would be noting, and notifying this Forgery: As we see in our Church by daily Experience in matters of less consequence, as in setting forth the Decrees of Cardinals, the Decisions of that *Roman* Court call'd the *Rota*, or any other thing of this nature. These Evidences make every one know these Decrees with an unquestionable credibility; which, when we have, we are sufficiently furnished, for as much as concerns the proposing of the Object to embrace with our Will these Decrees as proceeding from the Holy Ghost, and teaching Verities reveal'd by God, upon which we immoveably fix our Understanding, and we are resolv'd by our Will to fix it so firmly, because (by Gods Grace) we have a Will to proceed prudently in so important an Affair as the Salvation of our Soul, to which Heaven is offer'd if she will submit to believe what God thus reveals; and Hell is threatned if she will not thus submit. And this offer and threats are as prudently to be regarded,

as

as certain as English-men prudently believe, that there is such a City as *London*. Nothing then which is not most rational is requir'd of us, it being most manifestly made credible, that this is the true Command of God. Mad therefore is that Soul, which will not submit. See what I said in the former Section from the fifth Number to the end. And also what I fully express'd, *Sett. 16. N. 6.* For that which you add of forging a Canon of the Council of *Nice*, I doubt not but you may twenty times have have met with a satisfactory Answer thereunto. See *Baronius* or *Spondan. An. 419. N. 13.* Tell me, do forg'd Scriptures make the true Books of Scripture to become fallible?

22. *Ob. 19.* How shall I be assur'd of the meaning of the true Decrees when I now know them? For learned Men have been of contrary Opinions about the meaning of them? I answer, That to ease your tender Conscience, we will permit you not to give your assent to any thing, of which you are not in Conscience manifestly perswaded that this, and only this, is the true meaning of such a Council; so that you be ready prepar'd in Mind and Heart to submit to the true meaning, when you shall come manifestly to know it. To more than this we press
no,

no body; only let not People fain that they do not know what they know, or easily may know if they will: You must observe, that Councils use to be assembled against such and such known Opinions of Sectaries; against these they frame their Decrees so clearly, that the Sectaries themselves cannot find impudency enough to deny their Opinions to be clearly condemn'd, and the contrary clearly defin'd: Wherefore we see by experience they never so much as offer to do this; but all their Forces are bent to cry down and vilifie the Authority, by which they were condemn'd. Some other passages in Councils may be found to be of an ambiguous sense, and until those passages be by public Authority further declar'd, we hold no Man an Heretic for not taking them in the sense which some Men are most inclin'd to conceive them to be spoken. Hence appears the great benefit it is to have a living Judge, to whom all that is doubtful may be referr'd, and a clear Declaration procur'd, as it is expressly noted in the very end of the Council of *Trent*.

23. *Ob.* 20. What necessity of an infallible Judge at all? I answer first, Who assur'd you that God would give no Prerogative to his Church which is not precisely necessary for her very preservation?

Dr. Fern.

Dr. Fern professeth such a Judge would be of singular benefit for the keeping of Unity in the Church, and the ending all Controversies. See what I said, *Seēt. 18. N. 2.* I have also shew'd the great necessity of this Judge, *Seēt. 1. N. 4. &c.* True it is, during the most bloody Persecution of the first 300 years, the Christian World could not enjoy this benefit: But I pray note what St. Isidore says, *Præfat. in suam Canonum collectionem*; where having observ'd what I now said of the Persecutions hindering the keeping of the Councils, he adds, *That hence Christianity was torn into diverse Heresies, because license was not given to the Bishops to meet in Councils until the time of the foresaid Emperor* (Constantine:) And yet for the first three hundred years Tradition of all Points necessary, could not but be so fresh as to make a far less necessity of Councils than afterward, when Heresies had so opposed the first Traditions. But an infinite number sticking close to those Traditions were not only sav'd, but were glorious Martyrs in those first three Ages.

24. Thus having answer'd your twenty Questions pertinent to the Point of Infallibility, I come to give you satisfaction in an *Objection* wholly impertinent to this purpose. For it concerns not any Article defin'd

fin'd by our Church, but private Opinions of some private Divines in our Church, whose Opinions (tho' never so erroneous) ought not to hinder your conversion, if you were in earnest. Yet even in this I hope to give you satisfaction. Your Objection then is, P. 16. out of Dr. Taylor, endeavoring to prove our inconsistency with Civil Government, because some of our Divines teach, that which one or two, or some few of our Doctors say is lawful, may in our judgments, be done without mortal sin: But not only one, but many of our Doctors say 'tis lawful to Murder or Depose a Supreme Magistrate that is guilty of Heresie, or suspected of it; therefore *Cavete Principes Conclusionem*, say you; but according to truer Logic you should say *Cavete Principes Hæresim*. I Answer First, This Objection makes nothing against our Faith, but against private Opinions of private Divines, which Opinions he who will practise must expect public execution, which is so terrible, that it secures Princes more than any Preachers frightening them with fear of Sin. Secondly, I do nothing doubt but even those Divines would so limit, and restrain their loose opinion to such peculiar circumstances, as would presently clear, even their Opinion from being the least inconsistent with the

the present Government: Besides our cheerful willingness to take any Oath, and enter into any Bond, obliging us to the loss of all that in this World can be lost, if ever we so much as attempt the putting this Opinion in practice, which cheerful willingness I am sure you will find in any *Roman* Catholic Friend you have or can have in *England*. But I dare boldly say, that those very *Doctors* never intended to speak of the lawfulness of Murdering any Heretical King, or Governor in a Country, where that which they call Heresie, did already overwhelm the whole Nation. I say nothing of their other many Restrictions. As that the Heresie of such a Prince if he lives will certainly ruin his Country. That his Country will certainly be preserved by his Death, and no other way. And that for certain, by killing him no very great inconveniences will follow. All these, and other Restrictions even those Authors will require.

25. Again, Protestants, and those whom they own for their Brethren, have far more loose Principles than these are, uttered even by their prime Apostles of their Reformation. You own the *Wickeffians* for Brethren; they all believe that every Magistrate do's truly forfeit his Authority by Sinning. You own *Luther* for your
prime:

prime Patriarch, and Calvin for his second: The first is notoriously known to have Preached Rebellion, and to have said *that the Gospel is not Gospel except it be divulged with Tumults*; and Calvin speaks thus Cap. 6. in *Daniel*, v. 22. 25. *Earthly Princes do bereave themselves of Authority, when they erect themselves against God, and we must rather spit in their Faces than Obey them.* See *Beza de Jure Magistratuum in Subditos*: To say nothing of a world of others which might be cited, whom you hold not to have Erred fundamentally in true Religion, and consequently these their Errors not to be damnable. And the Author of *the End to Controversies* has lately in his Preface shewed in particular, how in every place but *England* your new Reform was brought in by Rebellion. And Dr. *Fern* Sect. 16. says, *Those Churches had but tumultuary Reformatiōs.*

26. Having now complied with your desire. I might claim the performance of your promise, but I know Gods grace must rather be earnestly begged, then you earnestly pressed. Lay prejudice aside, with other human respects, and pray humbly to know the Truth; and than by Gods Grace, that may be done, without which you will be eternally undone.

Sect. 25.

The Roman Church having been proved to be our infallible Judge, all under pain of Damnation are bound to submit to her Judgment.

I. **I**N my first Question I proved (N. 1.) that there must be some certain and assured means to end all Controversies or doubts, which either be or can be in Religion. And (N. 3.) I proved that all must needs agree in this, that our Understanding must be bound, under pain of Damnation, to submit it self to that infallible Judge or Rule appointed by God to decide all necessary Controversies. Now, because all Faith essentially consists in the inward understanding (which is the very seat of True or False Faith) God who looks into our interior Soul, exacts to see in that a ready embracing of that Faith, without which no Salvation is to be had: And therefore, as I said, he should not seriously desire our Salvation unless he desired that we interiorly should yield full assent to this one, and only saving Faith, of which Faith the Apostle said, that *without it, it was impossible to please God*, and St. Mark, *He who do's not believe shall be damned*. A false Faith,

Faith, taking the Belief of a Lie for a Divine Verity, can help to save no Body. All then to please God, and to be saved must have true Faith, which essentially consisting in the interior Judgment, God would have this Judgment readily to submit to the direction, or determination of that infallible Judge which was appointed by him as the only means to bring us assuredly to this one true Faith. I earnestly intreat the Reader to read the proof of all this in the place above cited, and *Seet. 16. N. 10.*

2. All this interior submission of Understanding, to be due even to all that is said in the Bible, and that even under pain of Damnation, will easily be granted by any Sectary, holding the Bible to be that only Rule and Direction which God has given every one, as the only means to bring him assuredly to the true Faith: We Catholics do no less readily than they, submit to the Bible as to Gods Word; but from the beginning to the ending of the Second Question, we have brought a World of evident and most convincing reasons, proving that the Scripture by it self alone, cannot be the only means appointed us by God to bring us to the assured knowledge of the true Faith necessary to Salvation; neither can it by it self alone, end and decide all Controversies about such

such matters of Belief and Practice as are wholly necessary to Salvation: This I have shewed in above Four and twenty particular Points; whence it follows, that God has appointed some other means for our certain and assured guidance in all these things. This other means I have proved, through all my Third Question, to be the infallible direction of the Church; and then I passed to shew at large (through all my Fourth Question) that this Church, whose direction is infallible, is the *Roman Church*, taking the *Roman Church* as containing all that whole Flock of *Christ's* Sheep adhering to the Bishop of *Rome*, as to their head Pastor, in what place of the World soever they live. I have shewed the Traditions of this Church to be infallible. I have shewed the Decrees or Definitions set forth in any lawful General Council of this Church to be infallible. Nothing of this I have supposed, but every particular here specified I largely prov'd, so that I do not here, without having first given full proof, Suppose this *Roman Church* to be infallible.

3. This then supposed, I do not see how our very Adversaries (convinced of the former Points) can deny that all submission, interior, and exterior, must of necessity be yielded to this Church, whose directions be infallible, and secured by the assistance

sistance of the Holy Ghost from all kind
 of Error; for, on the one side, there can-
 not be imagin'd the least fear of falling in-
 to any Error, by following our Guide,
 who is prov'd to be secure from leading
 into Error; and on the other side, this
 security from Error, proceeding from
 the promised assistance of the Holy
 Ghost, given to the Church purposely to
 direct all her Children, in all Points of
 that Faith which God exacts of all to
 please him, and to work their Salvation
 by it; and this direction being also the
 only safe and secure means which he has
 given us to this end, it is manifest that we
 sin damnably if we refuse to follow it.
First, Because it is a damnable sin not to
 submit to that Order of Government
 which the Divine Providence has by his
 Wisdom and also his Sovereign Autho-
 rity appointed unto all for their directi-
 on: For (as we at large shewed out of
St. Austin, Sect. 21. N. 5.) if God should
 give a Man Commission to direct us in
 such Points, unto which he would have
 all to conform, he who should refuse to
 submit to the direction of this Man,
 should be guilty of damnable Disobedi-
 ence, not so much towards this Man, as
 towards God who gave that Commission
 to this Man; so God (according to what
 has been proved) having given Com-
 mission

mission to the Church to decide and determine all our Controversies in Faith, and to direct us in all things necessary to Salvation, as well in Belief as Practice; to stand out against the Church, and not to submit to this Order appointed by God, is a most damnable sin of refractory Disobedience.

4. Secondly, We have no stricter Obligation impos'd by the Law of *Charity* towards our own selves, than to procure that last end for which we were Created, to-wit, the eternal Salvation of our Souls: We are sure this cannot be done, but by pleasing God, who is not pleas'd but by our profession of that only one true Faith, of which it is said, *without Faith it is impossible to please God*, Heb. 11.6. And he (who with this true Faith) *believes not*, shall be damn'd, Mark 16. 16. He then, who will not take pains and care to see himself securely settled in this true Faith (so wholly necessary to Salvation) is damnably guilty of uncharitableness towards his own Soul; whose greatest and eternal good he neglects to procure, by neglecting to procure the only means of true Faith, by which it can only be attained. And let no Body say this means is too hard to be procured by me, for I am no Scholar, but a poor ignorant Creature. This will not excuse you,

you, for God knew well enough, that the far greater part of those whom he created for Eternal Salvation, and oblig'd to work the same with fear and trembling, and for whom he died, shedding the last drop of his Blood, so to purchase a greater plenty of Graces for them; this God, I say, knew well enough, that the greater part of those, for which he died and suffered so much, were poor ignorant People; and therefore he had been no earnest lover of Souls, if he had not ordain'd some means so easie, even to the ignorant, that they thereby might effectually be brought to that true Faith, which he so rigorously exacts of all under pain of Damnation. This means, and this only means, I have prov'd at large to be the infallible guidance and direction of the Church, whose Traditions and Decrees in all Points necessary are so inculcated by every Preacher and Catechist of this Church, that it is impossible for any one, desirous of instruction, to live in ignorance of them; impossible to live according to them, and not to be saved. *For this Commandment which I command thee this day, is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off; It is not in Heaven, that thou shouldest say, who shall go up for us to Heaven, and bring it down unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? Neither is it beyond* the

528 *The Roman Church is*

the Sea, that thou shouldest say, who shall go over the Sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? But the Word is very nigh unto thee, Deuter. 30. 11. We exact not the knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew, and the use of near twenty Rules more, as I have shew'd our Adversaries to do, *Sect. 7. N. 6.* But we exact only the following this so known direction of the Church, *A way so direct that no fool can err in it.* And we having so groundedly seen that this is the direction given us by God to follow, we do not proceed blindly by following it with all submission; but no blindness is greater than in an unknown way, through which, of necessity we must pass at our Eternal Peril if we miss to refuse the following of an infallible Guide provided for us, and offer'd to us in this passage, and rather to yield our selves over to a confess'd fallible direction. What greater blindness?

5. Dr. *Fern* indeed, and Protestants discourse otherwise of the Submission due to the Church; but it is upon the false supposition that she is fallible; without they mean to discourse only of their own Church, and then they may truly suppose her as fallible as they please; and she being so fallible, they most unreasonably are still exacting of us even by most rigorous sequestration of all our Estates,

states, and by what other penalties they think fit, to leave that Church which we so groundedly hold to be the only infallible Guide appointed us by God himself, as the only means to direct us securely to our Eternal Salvation, and to yield exterior conformity to their own new moulded Church, which they all confess and profess to be fallible; which is to say, you must be undone in your estate, without you conform your selves to that new Reformation of ours, which *perhaps* is true. For we do not challenge infallible Truth to what we teach, we being fallible Men, and our Interpretations of Gods Word being only fallible; yet infallibly we will undo you, if you will not follow us; and yet if you do follow us *perhaps* you may be undone Eternally; for we cannot say, that our Church is infallible in what she teacheth contrary to yours. She may therefore deceive you to imbrace a Lie for a Divine Verity: For you must be forc'd to imbrace a Doctrine deduc'd by fallible Interpretations out of Scripture, which Interpretations the far greater and the far learnedest part of this present Age rejects as Heretical, and which as such were rejected by almost all visible Christianity for this last Thousand years, and which will perhaps shortly be rejected by us. For it is ordi-

nary with us (I speak what truly Protestants may speak) to reject that to day which yesterday we cry'd up for a Divine Verity.

6. Now all this being so truly spoken, I do not see what needs more to be spoken to vindicate and justify our most just Recusancy in refusing to submit to so preposterous proceedings of Men, when they, providing us no better security, enforce us to refuse due submission to that infallible direction of the Holy Catholic Church, most orderly appointed by God to bring us securely to that end for which he made us: To which God of his infinite Mercy vouchsafe to bring us all.

7. And thus having ended what I had to say of this most important matter, I must crave my Readers pardon for enlarging my self so diffusely. For I am wholly of the mind of that dear Friend of St. *Austin* call'd *Nebridius*, who was used to say, *That in a great Question be hated a short Answer*, *Aug. Tom. 1. Epist. 23. ad Bonif.* Wherefore in this Question of Questions Brevity might well be accounted hateful.

F I N I S.

A

ote-
day
vine

ren,
po-
just
fo
hen
en-
that
olic
God
nich
nite

had
r, I
en-
am
end
was
ba-

23.
n of
um-

um-
and
and
and
and
and
and